Labour Monthly

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

A MACAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

OUTLOOK FOR 1942

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month

World Battle by R.P.D.

and Articles by

THE BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD

HARRY POLLITT

DOROTHY WOODMAN

KRISHNA MENON

MICHAEL CARRITT

PETER KERRIGAN

WILLIAM RUST

SEAN O'CASEY and V. I. LENIN

JANUARY 1942 VOL. 24 No. 1 6D

Editorial and Publishing Offices: 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3 Telephone: FIN. 5135

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

READERS: BE ACTIVE

WE ASK every reader of *Labour Monthly* to examine this complete list of active *Labour Monthly Discussion Groups* and see if there is one in his or her town or borough. If there is, write to us for particulars. If there isn't, none the less write to us so that we can arrange contact between other interested readers near by and so get a new Group started. We are once more urging such steps because we want *all* our readers to become talkers too, and so persuade others. A true grasp of political realities is only obtained by essaying to give expression to political ideas. By itself, reading is not enough.

LABOUR MONTHLY DISCUSSION GROUPS

LONDON AREA

Acton, Catford, Clapton, Ealing, East Ham, Edmonton, Finchley, Forest Gate, Fulham, Golders Green, Greenwich, Hampstead, Hampstead Garden Suburb, Hanwell, Highgate, Holborn, Lambeths Leyton, Marylebone, North Kensington, Palmers Green, Plumstead, Primrose Hill, Putney, Shepherds Bush, South Kensington, Southwark, Walthamstow, Wandsworth, Westminster Willesden, Winchmore Hill.

HOME COUNTIES

Ashtead, Banstead, Barking, Beaconsfield, Beckenham, Bishops Stortford, Braintree and Silver End, Brentwood, Bromley (Kent), Buckhurst Hill, Bushey (Herts), Bush Hill Park, Caterham, Cheam, Chelmsford, Chingford, Chingford South, Claygate and Esher, Coulsdon, Dartford, Didcot, Dunstable, Edgware, Enfield, Enfield West, Epsom, Gerrards Cross, Goring-on-Thames, Grays (Essex), Guildford, Hanworth and Feltham, Harpenden, Harrow, Hatfield, Hayes (Middlesex), Hemel Hempstead, Hertford, Heston, Hillingdon, Hitchin, Hornchurch, Ilford, Iver (Bucks), Kenton, Letchworth, Maidenhead, Morden (Surrey), North Harrow and Rayners Lane, Northolt, Orpington, Pinner, Ruislip, St. Albans, Slough, Southall, Sunbury-on-Thames, Twickenham, Upminster, Wallingford, Wallington, Waltham Cross, Welling (Kent), Welwyn, Welwyn Garden City, Wembley, Whetstone, Windsor and Eton, Woodford.

PROVINCES

Abercynon, Aberdeen, Abertillery, Aberystwyth, Alloa, Andover, Arundel, Bacup, Barnstaple, Barrow-in-Furness, Basingstoke, Bath, Batley, Bedford, Biddulph, Birkenhead, Birmingham Handsworth, Washwood Heath, Sutton Coldfield), Blackpool (Cleveleys), Blyth, Bournemouth, Bowhill, Bridgend, Brighton, Bristol (Clifton), Brynmawr, Buckhaven, Burry Point, Bury, Cardiff, Cardigan, Carlisle, Cheadle, Cheltenham, Chester, Chichester, Chippenham, Cirencester, Cleethorpes, Clevedon, Coatbridge, Cowes, Crosskeys, Cudworth, Dartmouth, Derby, Doncaster, Dumbarton, Dumfries, Durham, East Grinstead, Edinburgh, Edgbaston, Exeter, Farnborough (Hants), Farnham, Fawley (Hants), Fleetwood, Folkestone, Glasgow (Parkhead Forge, Rutherglen), Gloucester, Grantham, Greenock, Halifax, Hereford, Horsham, Hyde, Kendal, Kidderminster, Leyland, Liverpool (Maghull), Llandudno, Llanelly (Felinfoil, Pwll, Llwynhendy), Luton, Macclesfield, Maidstone, Maldon (Essex), Manchester (Gorton, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, Whitefield), Mansfield, Marple, Medway Towns, Middlesbrough, Minehead, Nantwich, Neath, Nelson, Newark, Newcastle (Staffs), Newcastle-on-Tyne, Newquay, Newton (Montgomery), Paisley, Penrith, Perth, Peterborough, Portchester, Port Talbot, Preston, Reading, Renfrew, Renton (Alexandria), Rhondda (Ferndale, Porth, Tylorstown), Ringwood, Rugby, Rushden, Salisbury, Saltcoats, Scunthorpe, Sedgley (near Dudley), Shrewsbury, Sheffield, Somerton, Southampton, Stafford, Stockport, Stoke-on-Trent, Stone, Stourbridge, Stroud, Sunderland, Swindon, Talgarth, Tamworth, Tonypandy, Tonyrefail, Topsham, Tunbridge Wells, Walsall, Wareham, Warrington, Warwick, Wednesbury, Westbury, Weston-super-Mare, Winchester, Wirral, Wolverhampton, Woodbridge, Worcester, Worksop, Worthing, Wrexham, Yeovil.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANNOUNCEMENT

to all Subscribers to the Special *Labour Monthly* Edition of R. Palme Dutt's

"CRISIS OF THE BRITISH PEOPLE"

●

Dear Subscribers,

Publication of the greatly revised and amplified "Crisis of the British People," which has been so long awaited and to which you have subscribed, has unfortunately been finally defeated by the rapidly worsening paper situation. Paper supplies available to our movement are now severely limited, and the production of a volume of 640 pages in 14,000 copies has become impossible under present conditions.

To make publication possible within the present paper limitations would necessitate cutting out two-thirds of the book. Such a drastic cutting down would entirely destroy its value, and the Author, the Publishers and ourselves have had to agree that publication must be suspended until a more favourable situation.

We understand the disappointment this decision will cause our subscribers, who have waited with such exemplary patience; but we believe they will understand that such a difficult decision was only reached after every alternative had been explored.

Those of you who wish to have your money returned will of course be sent a remittance immediately we receive your intimation. We have, however, been able to enter into special arrangements by which we are able to offer to our subscribers an attractive alternative, viz.—

An important new work on the present urgent situation is being specially written by R. Palme Dutt, to be entitled "BRITAIN IN THE WORLD FRONT," which will be published in the early Spring at 7s. 6d. It will be of shorter compass than "Crisis of the British People," but will consist of entirely new material dealing with the critical problems of the new situation and putting forward a practical programme in comprehensive terms.

A special *Labour Monthly* edition of this work will be made available to all subscribers to "Crisis of the British People"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who indicate their willingness on the form below to transfer their subscription to the new book, which will then be despatched to them on publication.
N.B.—This special edition will be ready somewhat earlier than the public one, for which there is anticipated a heavy demand.

Alternatively, subscribers to "Crisis of the British People" may transfer their payment to—

An Eight Months' Subscription (post paid) to *Labour Monthly*, either for themselves, a friend or a new sympathizer.

We feel bound to say that it will be of the greatest assistance, and a token of good will to *Labour Monthly*, as well as, we believe, in their own interests, if subscribers will favourably consider these two alternatives, make their selection and indicate their decision on the form below, which should be sent to us as soon as possible.

We thank all of you for your support and look forward to its continuance in present difficulties. *Yours fraternally*,

"LABOUR MONTHLY" EDITORIAL BOARD.

TEAR HERE

To "LABOUR MONTHLY," 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3

.....1942

1—Please transfer my subscription previously sent you to R. P. Dutt's new book (special "Labour Monthly" edition), "BRITAIN IN THE WORLD FRONT," to be despatched to the address below.

Alternatively

2—Please return my subscription previously sent you.

Alternatively

3—Please transfer my subscription previously sent you into 8 months' Postal Subscription to "Labour Monthly."*

STRIKE OUT TWO OF THESE AND LEAVE THE ONE YOU SELECT

Name .....

Address .....

Block letters please

TO WHOM DID YOU PAY YOUR SUBSCRIPTION ?

(*L.M. direct? What bookseller? Organisation? Individual?*

.....

Please answer fully

*If for someone else, attach slip giving name and address

(Your signature) .....

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

World Battle—Axis Fascism and Democratic Front—Relative Strength—Potential and Actual Strength—Mobilise Our Forces—The Empire and the War—India—The Way to Co-operation—Britain's New Tasks—Full Mobilisation—Man-Power and Woman-Power—The Labour Amendment—Nationalisation and State Control—A Unified Plan—Women in Production—Political Tasks—Communist Party Campaign—Unity of the Labour Movement.

WITH 1942 the world battle enters on its decisive year. In the December, 1940, issue of the LABOUR MONTHLY we wrote of the "outlook for 1941" that "the transition from the European war of 1939-40 to the world war of 1941 onwards is in process." That transition is now completed with the two great extensions of the war in 1941: Germany's attack on the Soviet Union in June, and Japan's attack on the United States and Britain in December. The full thrust of Axis fascism for world domination is now exerting its maximum combined strength in all regions. The counter-thrust of the Red Army, checking and driving backwards the Nazi forces in Europe, is already the first foretaste of the future. But the initial successes of Japan's treacherous aggression in the Far East, and the signs of preparations for a renewed Nazi offensive in the West, or towards the Near East, indicate how heavy are the struggles still in front, which will require a far fuller mobilisation and action of all the world anti-fascist forces than has yet been achieved. The prophets of passivity and "wait till 1943" have been overtaken by the speed of events. 1942 already opens the year of great decisions.

THIS quantitative extension of the war to world war in 1941 has been accompanied by a still more profound change in quality. At last the World Democratic Front, for which we have striven for these ten years since Japan's first aggression in Manchuria, confronts fascism. The outstanding event of 1941 was not merely the new war offensive of June 22, but above all the world reaction to that new war offensive, which found expression in the British-Soviet Pact and in Anglo-American-Soviet-Chinese collaboration.

Fascism is now faced by a non-imperialist coalition of States and peoples, uniting the democratic aspirations of the peoples of the world, and combining in its leadership the two democratic imperialist Powers with the Socialist Power and the National Republic which is the vanguard of the colonial peoples. Whereas in the preceding phase of the war the national liberation struggles, as of Norway or Jugoslavia, though advancing in weight with the extension of Nazi aggression, were subordinate to the decisive imperialist factors, to-day the still-continuing imperialistic factors are subordinate to the liberation struggle of all peoples against fascist world domination, embodied equally in the role of the Soviet Union, the advancing resistance of China against aggression, the national movements of the European peoples enslaved by Nazism, and the defence of the national independence of the British and American peoples.

From this point a new hope and confidence, determination and will to victory

Vol. XXIV. No. 1. January, 1942.

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY

		Page
Notes of the Month *World Battle*	*by* R. P. D.	3
Anglo-Russian Unity	*by* THE BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD	11
The Communist Party and the Fight for Unity	*by* HARRY POLLITT	13
Japan	*by* DOROTHY WOODMAN	17
Wages and the War Effort	*by* PETER KERRIGAN	21
The Twelfth Anniversary of the *Daily Worker*	*by* WILLIAM RUST	25
India in the War	*by* V. K. KRISHNA MENON	26
Burma	*by* MICHAEL CARRIT	29
Imperialist War and National War	*by* V. I. LENIN	31
Book Review— A Soviet Play	*by* SEAN O'CASEY	32

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over fascism, has spread through the world. The epic of the six months' battle of the Soviet Union, the first successful turning back of fascist aggression, has given solid basis to that confidence. The alignment is clear and unmistakable for every man and woman on the planet. The battle is joined. The condition of all future advance is victory in this battle.

OVERWHELMING as are the potential resources on the side of the democratic front, there can be no under-estimating the formidable immediate strength which the Axis Powers are able to bring into the field. Immediately after the entry of the United States into the war the complacent calculation was widely repeated that four-fifths of humanity is now ranged in a single front against the Axis. Such a simple arithmetical totting up of populations, even if it were correct, is no serious measure of relative strength. And indeed the events of the first four days in the Pacific speedily dealt a cold shock of realism to the ready reckoners. It is obvious that one heavily-armed gangster can have a considerable initial advantage over four unprepared or inadequately-armed citizens. Decisive is not arithmetical numbers alone, but the degree of organisation and mobilisation, the level of technique, industrial development, military training, armaments and war production; and only a co-efficient of all these could measure relative strength.

AS soon as we begin to apply such a measure, the picture takes on a different aspect. For if some nine hundred millions, or nearly half of humanity, and more than half the "four-fifths of humanity" solemnly ranged by the ready reckoners in the anti-fascist front, consists of indubitably anti-fascist, but also heavily undeveloped, poverty-stricken and unarmed or under-armed masses of India, China and the colonial countries of the British Empire, then it is evident that such a statistician's army is more effective for a parliamentary White Paper than for routing panzer divisions—unless and until many further measures of mobilisation and equipment have been fulfilled.

ON bare numbers alone, the Axis Powers may be estimated to control some five to six hundred millions of people; Nazi Europe, directly or indirectly controlled (*i.e.*, all Europe excluding Britain and the Soviet Union), 320 millions; Vichy French colonies in North and West Africa, 30 millions; and the Japanese Empire, including Manchukuo, 140 millions; together with French Indo-China, 23 millions, Thailand, 15 millions, and partially occupied regions in China. As against this, the Quadruple Alliance holds direct sovereignty over some thirteen hundred millions (British Empire, 530 millions; U.S.S.R., 190 millions; U.S.A., 140 millions; China, 450 millions), together with control over considerable further territories and populations in Africa (with the exception of the Vichy French colonies in North and West Africa), the Middle East, the Dutch East Indies, etc.. and predominant influence in Central and South America. There is no question of the overwhelming superiority in numbers and resources. The question is the question of effective mobilisation.

IF, on the other hand, we exclude the *regions of colonial or semi-colonial* technique and development, we reach a different picture of effectively mobilised man-power in the two camps. On the basis of the "homelands," Nazi Germany represents 80 millions, Italy 45 millions, and Japan 100 millions, or a total of 225 millions. Britain and the white population of the Dominions represent 70 millions; the U.S.S.R. (prior to the invasion, but excluding the temporarily separated peoples of the new regions united since 1939), 170 millions; Continental United States, 130 millions; or a total of 370 millions. The balance is less uneven.

But to this estimate of available man-power in regions of more advanced technical development, it is necessary to add on the Axis side the subjugated peoples of Nazi Europe, directly or indirectly controlled by Nazi Germany, who, while not representing available military man-power, are compelled to labour for the Nazi masters, and represent (if we include the nominally neutral and independent, but in fact economically subjected and integrated Sweden, Switzerland, Spain and Portugal), nearly 200 millions, bringing the Axis total to 420 millions. It is evident that on this estimate, on the basis of available man-power in the regions of relatively more advanced technical devel-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opment, the balance between the two camps is far more even.

If we pursued this computation further in more realistic terms of effectively mobilised production, machinery and horse-power, or of estimated armed strength and the present rate of arms production, there is no doubt that the outcome would further reinforce this picture and underline the urgency and magnitude of the task on which we are engaged.

IT is therefore no matter for surprise that, despite the overwhelming potential superiority in numbers and resources of the anti-fascist front, the official spokesmen on both sides should freely anticipate the possibility of a prolonged, as well as arduous, conflict. "The ordeal will certainly be hard and will probably be long" (Churchill in the House of Commons, December 8). "It will not only be a long war, it will be a hard war" (Roosevelt speech of December 10). "It will be a long war" (*Pravda*, quoted in Soviet War News, November 3). "We have a long and hard war before us" (Sir Kingsley Wood in the House of Commons, December 16). "We must prepare ourselves for a long and bitter struggle" (Goebbels in *Das Reich*, December 21). "If it were necessary, Europe could face a thirty years' war" (Ribbentrop, speech to the Axis Conference in Berlin, November 25). We shall only be able to defeat these prognostications, and secure that speedier victory, and that collapse of Hitlerite Germany within one year, which Stalin declared to be attainable in his speech of November 7, not by empty aspirations, blinding our eyes to the hard facts, but by serious mobilisation of our full resources.

FOR the resources of the world democratic front are still far from being effectively mobilised or co-ordinated. This is the main practical lesson of the present urgent situation. Potential resources must be made actual before the necessary superiority can be established against the Axis. Only in the case of the one hundred and ninety millions of the Soviet Union can there be said to be full mobilisation and planned utilisation of all man-power and productive resources; and the result is already visible in the successes gained against nine-tenths of the Nazi military machine; while the remaining one-tenth, together with Japan, is able to cause heavy difficulties for the seven hundred millions of the British Empire and the United States Drastic measures will be necessary to change this situation, which is rendered the more urgent by the immediate effects of Japan's offensive, with the consequent increased strain on the American navy, arms supplies and available shipping, the prospect of intensification of the Battle of the Atlantic, and increased responsibilities thrown on Britain.

THE full mobilisation, not merely of Britain and the United States in association with the Soviet Union, but of all the five hundred millions of the peoples in the British Empire, is the necessary answer to the total offensive of the Axis Powers with Japan's new thrust.

But this requires a new political as well as a new economic approach. It is a glaring revelation of the blindness to the strategic realities of the present situation that the Prime Minister's review of the whole field of the war in the Far East on December 11 should have completely omitted any reference to the four hundred millions of India and Burma who are so vitally affected and who are destined to play, in association with the Chinese people, the crucial role in the future establishment and maintenance of peace and democracy in Eastern Asia. Yet it is precisely these who constitute the main basis of the numbers whose abstract total was so complacently paraded. The seventy millions of Britain and the white population of the Dominions are outnumbered by Nazi Germany alone. The five hundred and thirty millions of the British Empire are equal in numbers to all the populations controlled by the Axis.

There is, however, no room for illusions. The willing co-operation of the Indian nation has not yet been won. Of the five hundred and thirty millions in the British Empire, three hundred and ninety millions are represented by India, and some seventy millions by the remaining colonial countries. Their active and willing co-operation has still to be won; their resources are still hardly beginning to be brought into play, compared with the possibilities. This position can only be changed by ending the reactionary economic and political policies which stand in the way of such co-operation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TAKE the position of India, which now represents a first-class political, economic and strategic problem of the World Alliance. Here are nearly four hundred millions of people, whose profound anti-fascist sympathies have been shown in practice for a decade in their support to China, Abyssinia and Spain, at a time when the political leaders in this country were still assisting and arming fascism. Yet the total armed forces recruited number under one million men or 0.25 per cent. of the population ("There is no lack of men: since the outbreak of war recruiting offices all over the country have been congested with volunteers from every class, community and occupation to such an extent that it soon became impossible to deal with their numbers"—"India at War," Government Report, 1941). It was proudly reported in November that 50,000 workers were now employed in the Government Ordnance factories, or one in eight thousand of the population. Recently the second batch of *fifty* Indian workers arrived in this country for industrial training—from a population of four hundred millions. And meanwhile the authorities here wring their hands over the problem of man-power.

A RADICAL change of policy is here imperative. The basis of anti-fascist co-operation with the accredited representatives of the Indian nation and the Burmese nation needs to be urgently established. The release of some of the political prisoners in India is a welcome first step. But the remaining political prisoners include precisely the working-class prisoners, the Socialists, Communists and trade unionists, who would be the most active in rousing mass support for the anti-fascist struggle. Their release is essential. The recent explicit declarations of the Government denying the application of the Atlantic Charter, with its principle of the self-determination of all nations, to India, are a blow in the face to the democratic aspirations of the Indian people and a gift to Hitler and Japan. These declarations need to be reversed, and negotiations opened with the representatives of the National Congress to reach the basis of co-operation in the common fight.

WHOEVER, whether English or Indian, places obstacles in the way of such co-operation is in fact, for whatever reasons, and whether consciously or unconsciously, assisting Hitler and Japan, and therefore acting against the interests both of the Indian people and of the people of this country. The latest indications from the side of the national movement, such as the statements of Nehru after release, although still hypothetical and reserved, reflect the recognition that "the present war is not imperialistic in the sense that it was when it broke out" (message to the Congress members of the United Provinces Legislative Assembly, *Daily Herald*, December 12), and that "the forces of progress must be aligned with Russia, China and the United States" (*Daily Herald*, December 11). But from this it inevitably follows that the Indian national movement, as one of "the forces of progress," must find its alignment with the alliance of States composing this camp, even while at the same time it presses its justified democratic demands. For us in this country the responsibility falls, especially on the labour and democratic movement here, to do all in our power to remove the obstacles which reactionary policy from this side places in the way of such essential co-operation.

WHAT of the position in Britain? Can we be satisfied that there is full mobilisation here, or planned utilisation of resources, especially in view of the increased needs arising from the conflict in the Far East, the limitation of American supplies, the sharp possibility of a renewed Nazi offensive in the West, and the consequent increased urgency of the speediest establishment of that Second Front in Europe which would be the most effective accompaniment to the opportunity provided by the Soviet advance in Eastern Europe, in order to take the initiative out of Nazi hands, forestall their new offensive, and deliver simultaneous smashing blows against the Nazi military machine? The assumption now begins to find expression in some quarters that, following Japan's offensive and the new problems raised, the question of the Second Front in Europe must be regarded as necessarily shelved. If this defensive and defeatist response to the Axis attack is allowed to gain ground, then the result will be not only to hand back the initiative to Nazism, but a point may even be reached when the Second Front in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

West will indeed be established in spite of the critics, but on this island in place of on the Continent of Europe.

THE passivity of the first five months, in the period of greatest opportunity, undoubtedly encouraged Japan's offensive. The need for an active policy is greater than ever ; but the possibility of such an active policy depends on precedent conditions in the home situation, especially in respect of the strengthening of the political forces represented in the Government, and in respect of the organisation and rapid drive forward of war production. The lesson of recent events has reinforced the necessity for strengthening the Government, and for the elimination of all proven weak and defeatist elements from its ranks and from all commanding positions (the United States has lost no time in drawing the lesson of the blows received in the Pacific by removing those responsible from the highest commanding positions). It has still more reinforced the need for tackling seriously the questions of production, man-power and economy, ending the still continuing chaos and divided counsels, and overcoming the obstructive vested interests which are throttling the national effort.

THE Government's man-power proposals represent an important step forward. But they cannot in themselves be more than a partial step in relation to the comprehensive policy that is needed. The successive extension of the ages of call-up as the only answer to every weakness of productive organisation is no substitute for the planned utilisation of the man-power and productive resources of the country as a whole, including the more effective utilisation of the already available man-power. The Prime Minister's review in his speech to the House of Commons on December 2 stated that the number of women in industry and the services was equivalent, allowing for the increase in population, to the number at the end of the last war ; while there were one million more men in the arms industries than at the end of the last war. In relation to the total increase of population by some four millions since the last war, and in view of the considerably lower total numbers in the armed forces than at the final stage of the last war (six millions at the peak, and possibly not more than half to two-thirds that now), this would appear to indicate that the level of mobilisation attained at the end of the last war has not yet been reached.

DESPITE the limits on exact information, the weakness of the present position is manifest. In the debate on production on July 29, 1941, Mr. Churchill claimed that "in this seventh quarter of the war our output has equalled our production in the fourteenth and culminating quarter of the last war ; we have rather more workers in the metal industry than we had then." This claim would imply that, with all the technical advance of the past twenty years, with a larger population, with less men in the armed forces, and with more workers in the arms industries, output was still only reaching the level of the last war. It is only necessary to contrast the advance in Nazi Germany to see the seriousness of this situation. Similarly the statement of the Chairman of the Engineering Industries Association in September, 1941, may be recalled :—

> It was the unpleasant truth that war production in the engineering industries, measured by square feet of factory space or pound weight of production for each man-hour, had declined. The principal cause was the lack of an adequate and comprehensive plan to use to the full all production capacity and every available man-hour, both managerial and operative. . . . Production engineers and manufacturers knew that efficiency could be greatly increased, and that the total capacity of the country was far from being fully employed. (E. C. Gordon England, Chairman of the Engineering Industries Association, *Times* report, September 25, 1941.)

This is the judgment, not of a Socialist critic of capitalist industry, but of a leading industrialist addressing a meeting of production engineers.

THE demand voiced by the back bench Labour amendment, supported by 35 Labour M.P.s, for the "public ownership and control" of all "industries vital to the successful prosecution of the war, and especially transport, coal-mining and the manufacture of munitions," may not have been framed in the most effective form to present the decisive issue at the existing stage so as to secure a beginning of action in place of an academic debate. The raising of the abstract issue of all-round nationalisation at this point only plays into the hands of the reactionaries

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who are on the eager look-out to resuscitate the ancient controversy and run a nationalisation scare in order to shift the plane of the debate and conceal and protect the chaos of the existing system with its free play of the monopolists. But the spirit of the demand undoubtedly expressed the feelings of the overwhelming majority of the Labour movement, and of millions of men and women beyond the Labour movement. It expressed the feeling that such heavy demands on life must be accompanied by equal demands on property. It expressed the indignation that the emergency powers to conscript life and property, announced with such a blowing of trumpets by Mr. Attlee in the spring of last year, should have in practice been used with the utmost freedom against the workers, but never against fundamental property rights or a big monopolist.

THE contrast is too striking to be ignored and runs to the root of the problems of war organisation. For the workers there is compulsory transfer, the essential work order and compulsory arbitration. But for the big employers? Even Regulation 78A, empowering the replacement of the management by a government controller in firms obstructing the war effort, has remained a dead letter. Government factories have been transferred to private management, but not vice versa. The "shadow" factories, built with public money, have been handed over to the agents of the aircraft ring to run. Coalowners who have refused to consult the Mines Department on the closing down of particular pits have got away with it. The big firms in iron and steel, aluminium, machine-tool and aircraft have refused to allow government inspection of their books; and the Committee of Public Accounts in their report of 1940 has had to complain that the powers to compel unwilling firms to agree to such inspection have not been used, with the result that no proper investigation has been possible. The questions here at issue are no questions of ultimate social theory, but are vital questions of immediate war organisation and effective public control. The back bench Labour amendment above all voiced the demand of the key workers in war industry to end the chaos and disorganisation through vested interests which is hampering their efforts to drive forward production.

SIR JOHN ANDERSON'S hoary gibes in reply about Old Masters, wines and cigars may be good enough for the muzzy somnolence of the Carlton Club; they will not raise the credit of the Government with the intelligent public. It is intolerable if under cover of such "arguments" the Steel Control, manned by the Steel Trust and paid by the Steel Trust, are restricting the production of steel below even the already restricted pre-war level. It is intolerable that the coalowners should maintain the peacetime machinery of the district quota system, invented to restrict production, and obstruct the necessary national unification. It is intolerable that the Railway Executive, consisting of the General Managers of the main lines, should maintain the overlapping and refusal of pooling consequent on the sectional interests of the main lines, and that even proposals for the unification of all transport put forward by the Ministry of War Transport should be turned down by the pull of private interests with the Government. It is intolerable that the main levers of the economic life of the country, and the obstruction to any unified plan essential for expanding war production, should be left in the hands of the main apostles of the decadent monopolist restriction policies of the past decade and of political Munichism, Montagu Norman, the old colleague of Schacht, at the head of the Bank of England, and Sir Horace Wilson, the inspirer of Chamberlain and architect of Munich, at the head of the Treasury and of the Civil Service.

DRASTIC changes are here necessary on the economic front; and the working-class movement will need to play the decisive role in pressing them through. The immediate line of advance, however, does not lie in pressing the general demand for all-round nationalisation (although this question may need to come to the forefront in the special cases of the mines and the railways). The demand for all-round nationalisation, leading only to the traditional peacetime party alignment on this issue, will only be used by the Munichites to obstruct any change, just as it is used by the Trotskyists to dis-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rupt the national front. The key to advance at the present point lies in the question of effective State control in place of the existing sham controls; and the operation of such State control, with the participation of working-class representatives at the top as well as at the point of production, to carry through a unified plan of expanded war production and override all sectional interests standing in the way.

PUBLIC check, costing and investigation of accounts, as well as regional executive powers for the regional boards, the establishment of joint production committees in all enterprises and the co-ordination of the joint production committees with the regional and national machinery need to be an essential part of this. The present controls are window-dressing from the standpoint of the public interest; they are manned and dominated by the monopoly representatives within each industry; and they operate only as weapons of the monopolists for their own protection, against their smaller and medium rivals, to hasten the process of concentration, and against real public control. They need to be reorganised and strengthened as independent organs of control, with the inclusion of working-class representatives and independent representatives, and with only minority representation of those financially interested in the industry; and they need to be allotted their task, under a central planning body, in accordance with a unified plan for the full utilisation of the man-power and productive resources of the country.

THE key to the question of man-power, for the simultaneous development of the armed forces and the maximum extension of industry, lies in the role of women in production. In his speech of December 2 Mr. Churchill referred to the eleven million "married women or women doing necessary household work" as "our largest reserves for industry and home defence in the future." Yet here also there was no sign yet of any practical plan to make this potential reserve actual strength in the year of the crisis of man-power, that is, in 1942 'the crisis of man-power and woman-power is at hand and will dominate the year 1942"). Unless social provision is made for those household responsibilities, whose present barbarically primitive handicraft scale of organisation under modern large-scale capitalism makes eleven million grown persons spend their lives doing the work of two millions, this potential reserve remains an imaginary figure of speech and a merely rhetorical total. Yet the total number of day nurseries now in operation in the entire country (November, 1941) is 194, with 209 more approved, but not yet working, or sufficient for 15,000 children! And the total addition at present planned is 264 "in active preparation" (Government answer in the House of Lords, December 9). This is equivalent to a policy of cynical indifference which appropriately parallels the waste and disorganisation in industry. In the one case the fear of and subservience to the powerful vested interests, in the other case the fear of the far-reaching social changes involved, paralyses the action of the Government, and prevents the effective mobilisation of the strength of the nation. Only the active role of the working-class and democratic forces can help to change this.

A SERIOUS approach to the really extended entry of women into industry requires, in the first place, the tackling of the question of women's wages and rates. The Ministry of Labour census of the earnings of six million wage earners in July, 1941, showed the average earnings (including all bonuses, overtime, etc., and prior to all deductions) of £2 4s. 4d. weekly for adult women, as against £4 19s. 3d. for adult men, or considerably less than half. This low general average contains much lower averages in specific industries, running down to 37s. and 39s. —averages which in turn conceal lower actual rates. The overcoming of these scandalously low earnings makes necessary, not only the effective establishment of the principle of equal pay for equal work and the rate for the job, whether performed by a man or a woman, as has been successfully established in certain industries (*e.g.*, bus transport), but also and especially the raising of the present low rates paid to women where jobs are classified as "women's jobs," and the beginning of the ending of that fundamental wage differentiation which is based on the fallacious assumption that the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

woman wage earner has no dependents. If this is not tackled, the widespread entry of women into industry, which is indispensable for the war effort, would become equivalent to a retrograde step to replace men's labour by cheap labour for the employers. Second, the widespread entry of women into industry requires extended training of women in industry, and effective measures to ensure that employers utilise the maximum proportion of women in accordance with their training. Third, it requires an immediate large-scale programme for the establishment of nurseries, canteens and communal feeding centres, and the organisation of improved transport and shopping facilities, in order to diminish hindrances to the fulfilment of the role of women in war production.

ALL these and a hundred more problems of the effective mobilisation of the full strength of the people of this country for the critical battles of 1942 now stand before us. The new plans for the co-ordination of the action of the Allies are at present being prepared. Our tasks will undoubtedly demand intensified effort in order that we may turn the balance of the world situation in our favour. This requires the simultaneous strengthening of national unity and of the widest mass awakening to drive forward ruthlessly in the cause of victory. It requires the strengthening of the Government, and of the democratic anti-fascist forces in the Government, and of the democratic anti-fascist forces throughout the country. The key to this lies through the ending of the passivity of the Labour movement and the renewed activity of the Labour movement as the cardinal driving force in the common national front. But the realisation of this role depends on the unity of the Labour movement.

HENCE the Communist Party, which enters on its campaign with the New Year to mobilise support for the programme it puts forward to fulfil the urgent tasks which face the people in 1942, places in the forefront this question of the unity of the Labour movement. We have at the present moment the international unity of a great and growing Alliance of States and peoples against the common enemy represented by Axis fascism. We have a very high degree of national unity behind this Alliance. We have the British-Soviet trade union unity, the conferences in support of which will be held throughout the country. The Anglo-Soviet unity movement, supported by representatives of all parties and of non-political organisations, extends in a striking fashion. Yet that unity of the working-class movement, which should be the kernel and driving force in all this activity, has not yet been achieved.

HEREIN lies the essential weakness of the present political situation, which reflects its consequences in a thousand forms in daily policy, in the unchecked role of the Munichites, in the absence of an effective economic programme. We must set ourselves to overcome this weakness in 1942. Unity and co-operation is in fact advancing in all parts of the country; but it is not yet established in an organised form and on a national scale; and the bans and barriers derived from a preceding period still hamper the essential common work and spread discouragement and frustration. The establishment of an active, advancing united Labour movement, drawing in all sections in equal participation and playing its full part in the life of the country and in the common effort, with the enthusiastic support of millions, would greatly change the present situation and hasten the accomplishment of all those tasks which are essential for the speediest achievement of the common aim of victory over fascism.

R. P. D.

BOUND VOLUMES 1941. Orders can still be accepted up to, *but not later than*, January 15th. Price 10s. 6d. Price in Part Exchange for at least 10 loose copies (May, June, August and December MUST be sent) 6s. 0d. Postage of 8d. must be added in all cases. Will readers please let us have their orders, remittances and loose copies (in good condition, fit for binding) as soon as possible.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Anglo-Russian Unity

by the BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD

THE last six months have produced the most surprising transformation in the political outlook for the post-war world. Every intelligent person should endeavour to understand what has happened, and the significance of those happenings for the future settlement of the European countries, and indeed for the world as a whole!

Up till May last it appeared as if Russia had lost interest in, and contact with, the affairs of Europe. Confident in her own military strength (and few people outside her own borders believed that Russia really was strong), she had withdrawn from the European cockpit, and behind the buffer territory of Eastern Poland and the Baltic States she was content to leave the contesting nations to fight one another to their hearts' content.

Hitler's incorrigible lust for power suddenly transformed the whole situation. In a fit of the maddest folly he struck at Russia!

Probably he believed, as indeed did most people, many of whom might be expected to know the truth, that Russia was weak, that her armies were ill-armed and out-of-date, her generals hopelessly incompetent, and the Soviet Republics so rotten with dissension that at the first blow from a well-armed adversary the whole State would fall like a house of cards. Had not the famous Colonel Lindbergh told him some such tale? Indeed, he had nosed out the truth about the Russian Air Force and whispered it all into the gloating ears of Hitler and Goering. Here was an easy prey: one good blow in the *solar plexus* and the Russian heavyweight was down and out.

All the world knows what has happened. Germany has broken her teeth on Russia. The heavyweight could not only "take it," but he could stand up round after round, and at his own chosen moment turn the tables on his adversary. Though it is too early yet to say that Russia has thrashed Germany, one thing is certain: Germany can never beat Russia! Her eventual defeat is assured, and when the "Cease fire" is blown it will be found that Russia has emerged from retirement from Europe and she will rightly claim to share with ourselves and America the post-war settlement of the world.

It would require a knowledge of the nations of the world such as few people possess to disclose the full significance of this statement, for it must be remembered that the entrance of Japan into the war brings Asia and America into the jig-saw puzzle which already includes the whole of Europe and the lands on the south shore of the Mediterranean Sea. I claim no such knowledge, and I cannot pretend to estimate in even the most general terms the terrific possibilities the future holds, but there are a few fairly obvious points which suggest themselves to an ordinarily intelligent observer.

The first point to grasp firmly is that circumstances have thrown our nation and Russia into one another's arms. Writing as a Christian, I would say God has done this! We are suffering and bleeding together, aiding one another in every possible way, in a great common cause. Apart from our united contribution to world-settlement, we have much to give one another and much to learn from one another.

Russia has made a great democratic experiment. Amidst the fog created by prejudice and boycott, coupled with the deliberate misrepresentation of the situation, it has been hard to learn the truth about conditions in that country. But the war has lifted the curtain!

We know now something of the vast industrial expansion which has taken place, the beautiful cities which have been built, the great engineering achievements, the efficiency of the general organisation of life which has taken place. Passionate love of country beats in Russian hearts, and some who can speak with real knowledge tell us that the Christian religion is still a mighty force in the land.

I do not think we either shall or can take over the Russian interpretation of democracy *in toto*. The democratic ideal takes many shapes, and the shape is determined very largely by the tastes, the outlook, the characteristics of particular nations. The core of democracy is always

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the same, and that is the doctrine that the State is the servant of the man, that the State exists for the betterment and the happiness of the individual and not vice versa.

That doctrine has expressed itself in one way in Russia ; with us it is making itself felt insistently and with growing force, but rather by a steady process than by a volcanic eruption. But the link between us and Russia is unmistakable : we both share the democratic ideal, and it is on that basis that the world must be reconstructed.

Russia, again, is a peace-loving nation. Few people whose eyes were not blinded by political prejudice could have believed the fairy tales we were told about Russia being anxious to set the whole world ablaze by instigating a world revolution to force her form of government upon all other nations. Why, in the name of commonsense, should any nation behave in this idiotic way ? Nations have striven for world conquest in order that they may seize the wealth and trade of their neighbours, but never has any nation dreamed of world conquest in order that it may enjoy the pleasant sight of seeing everyone else governed in the precise way which is to that nation's taste.

In fact, and particularly in recent years, Russia has been definitely pacific. She saw far more clearly than did our statesmen whither things were trending. After the aggression of Germany against Austria, Litvinoff proposed his anti-aggression alliance between Russia, Great Britain, France and Czecho-Slovakia to resist further aggressive acts. That great act of foresight failed to produce any result because of the deplorable inability of the French statesmen and our own to see beyond their own noses. But had Litvinoff been listened to there would probably have been no war !

Because of that blunder on our part, not unreasonably, Russia withdrew from the storm which was plainly brewing, and devoted her powers to ensuring security for herself. There can be no doubt that that is how the non-aggression pact with Germany came about.

We have learnt our lesson now. Russia is our natural ally against the ferocious and vindictive common enemy.

Russia hates war. Is it too much to hope that she, with us who hate war as she does, will help to police the world and prevent a recurrence of the madness of war ?

It is now well known that it was only with the deepest reluctance and repugnance that Russia diverted so much of the wealth she wished to spend on the cultural improvement of her people, to the task of munitions-making. She is determined to make her country safe from another invasion. Can we arrive at an agreement with her that we shall unite to safeguard at least Europe from another war ?

We have the power to do it if we will, but if this is to be brought about we must have full faith and complete confidence in one another. The seeds of this have been sown. Russia has earned our respect by her efficiency and her dogged courage. That respect must be developed into a better understanding of all things Russian.

She has produced great writers and thinkers, great musicians, great men of science, great organisers. While stupid people were telling us of the unhappy conditions that prevailed there, her people were building up the life of a very great nation.

Now we know she wants to be friends with us. Let us grasp the hand extended to us, and in real mutual trust in one another we may not only help each other but re-create the world.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Communist Party and the Fight for Unity

by HARRY POLLITT

SLOWLY the mobilisation of Britain for victory over fascism gets into its stride. 1942 opens with the new man-power decisions coming into force. However drastic in character they may appear to be, they are in point of fact long overdue. The revolution that they effect in the lives and habits of millions of British citizens, who never thought that war would affect them so closely, will be welcomed by all who recognise how grave the position is, what is at stake, and what still needs to be done before the victory is achieved.

Only out of continued crisis and struggle are the weapons of victory being forged, and the man and woman power to use them at last being brought together. *They* can, in their application, bring about a further unity between all those for whom no sacrifice is too great in order to preserve the decencies of life and the possibilities of social progress, which in our present epoch can be guaranteed only by the elimination of fascism and all its attendant barbarism.

For fascism can be defeated only by a united people, supporting with full confidence a National Government determined to achieve a British-Soviet victory.

The recognition of this political fact, long delayed but at last gaining increasing conviction, has been borne in on the consciousness of the people not only through adversity but by the positive aspects of the resistance of the Soviet people. For in countless discussions it has been understood that to explain the magnificent character of this resistance, there must have been not only military preparedness, strategy and genius, but a political and moral unity of a kind representing something entirely new in world history.

This unity alone explains the difference between what happened when Poland, Norway, Holland, France and Belgium were attacked by Hitler, and what happened when, enormously strengthened by his conquests of these countries, he attacked the Soviet Union. In the first instance we saw only capitulation and defeat; in the other we see a resistance that, while retiring on some sections of the vast battlefront, gives decisive counter-blows on other sections—and does so after five months of the greatest military struggles in the history of the world.

This role played by the political and moral unity of the people in the struggle against fascism is given further significance when the battles in Libya are set alongside those on Soviet territory. At first it was anticipated that the Imperial Forces would have a comparatively easy task when the Libyan offensive was announced, but soon it became apparent what fighting against fascism means, when it is the Nazi brand and not the Italian. The hard tasks the Imperial Forces have had to perform on this much smaller front only serve to heighten the respect aroused by the resistance of the Soviet people, with forty and fifty times more force arrayed against the Red Army than has been used by the fascists in Libya.

This is why, when victory is still to be won at such a terrible cost, we welcome every decision of the Government that reveals the intention to place our country on a real war footing. Great and overwhelming as the resources of Britain, the Soviet Union and America are, they are not yet brought together, organised, and pooled on that common basis which makes them totally effective at the present time. Furthermore, weakened as fascism is by the terrific blood-letting inflicted on it by the Red Army, it is a long way from being exhausted or finished. To wipe fascism off the face of the earth will still require enormous efforts; victory will never come by itself; and in Britain especially there is still a tremendous way to go before the entire people realise that they are engaged in a life and death struggle, without parallel in the past, which will demand

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

far more drastic adjustments in our lives and habits before we are finally through with the job.

At the same time it is necessary to emphasize in the sharpest possible manner that there needs to be a far greater equality in sacrifice than exists at present, because the National Government is not as yet truly representative of the people. We may be sure that the man-power decisions, affecting the life and work of millions of the working people, will be enforced far more effectively than the emergency Orders in Council regarding property—announced with such a flourish of trumpets in May, 1940—have been. That this opinion is shared by large sections of the people was shown in the votes registered against the Government in the recent Parliamentary debate on the new man-power proposals. They were not votes, so far as the Labour and Liberal Members of Parliament were concerned, against the Government and national unity, but against the one-sided character of sacrifices that are imposed on the working people, and the sincere belief that public ownership of certain industries would lead to increased and more efficient production. The votes registered were of great significance that will compel due attention being paid to them.

There are still too many shameful contrasts in Britain between the lives of the rich and those of the poor. These represent in fact a barrier to the supreme efforts that have to be made. War, with all its horrors and hardships, is still a million miles away from the lives of a small section of the people, whose political influence in the Government and its policy has nothing in common either with the wishes or aspirations of the majority of the people. So long as these harmful influences are allowed to flourish, the national effort loses much of its power and its future possibilities.

Since the invasion of the Soviet Union millions of people in Britain have read and studied everything they could get hold of that told them about the new world that has been organised in the Soviet Union. They now understand that the resistance of the Soviet people has reached such heroic heights because the sacrifice is a common one, because no rich and poor classes exist side by side, no one makes profit out of war, no craft obstacles impede production, no Black Markets exist, because there is complete equality as between man and woman, and the care of children, the equipment of nurseries, and communal feeding are organised and encouraged to allow women to play their full part in helping to destroy fascism—and this understanding has led to a growing impatience that we still tolerate so many things that could be abolished to-morrow and thus give an enormous stimulus to the united will and determination to secure victory.

Victory in this terrible war will go to that group of nations which has the greatest preponderance of war materials, and men and women ready and eager to bear arms. Pious hopes about "the righteousness of our cause," that "we always win the last battle," that "things will turn out all right in the end," these have no place in the world of to-day. The scandal is that the countries allied against the Axis Powers have this overwhelming preponderance in their grasp, if only it was organised. Nothing would go further in achieving it than for our Government in particular to make now the same relentless attack on wealth and privilege as it is making on the man-power problem by the proposals now coming into operation.

In this setting the unity of the people takes on added urgency and importance, for the more united they become the sooner they can root out all the old methods, habits, obstacles, vested interests, hesitations and wishful thinking that are yet preventing the full and complete organisation and use of our resources and people.

At this moment the Communist Party places the question of unity as the central political question facing the people in general and the working-class movement in particular. Everything depends on how quickly and effectively this unity is organised. On its rapid growth and its strength depends the speedy and decisive defeat of Hitler. On this, too, depends the success of the movement for the reorganisation of the Government into a government more united and really representative of the people, with the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Men of Munich eliminated. On it depends how effectively we fulfil our obligations under the terms of the Anglo-Soviet Alliance.

Above all, the Communist Party in this situation places in the forefront the whole question of the independent role and responsibility of the labour movement, upon which in the last analysis everything finally depends.

In this fight for unity, sectional aims or motives cannot be allowed any place. There is only one issue in politics to-day : who is for or against the defeat of fascism? Everything else is secondary to that, for every question of future development depends on whether fascism is defeated or not.

This is why the Communist Party in December addressed a new appeal to the membership of the Labour Party, Trade Union Congress, and Co-operative Movement. It did so because it believes this is the time when an entirely new approach should be made to remove the barriers and obstacles still hindering the full development of that mighty movement of working-class and national unity which would bring about a remarkable change in everything associated with the mobilisation of the whole people, and ensure their future when the peace has been won. We believe that all serious-minded members of the Labour Movement will agree that such a new approach should be made. More and more the conviction grows in the factories and workers' organisations that if the Governments of Britain and the Soviet Union can, in the hour of their mutual peril and crisis, find the way to alliance and agreement, why not the working-class movements of Britain? Since the signing of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Agreement this question has been increasingly asked.

The Anglo-Soviet Alliance and the resistance of the Soviet people have aroused a mass movement of solidarity of a really remarkable character. It has taken forms of activity never before witnessed in Britain. It has brought together people of the most diverse views, who have been astonished to find so many points of agreement in their common desire to go about their lawful occasions as free citizens, not menaced by the bestiality of fascism. It is something new, that has tremendous possibilities for the future when many serious questions will have to be solved if the people are to reap the full reward of their present sacrifices and fortitude.

Why then should it be impossible for every section of the working-class movement that works for the defeat of Hitler, to work together? How can bans, and prohibitions against working with Communists, be defended in this terribly grave emergency? How petty and small it seems for instructions to be given that a Labour man must not speak on the same platform as a Communist! What purpose is now served by an attitude that takes the form, in actual fact, of saying, "The only good Communists are those who are dead or dying in the Soviet Union"? However hard that expression may seem, it is what the present attitude of refusing to work with British Communists amounts to.

The past has its memories for all of us in the working-class movement. They can be as strong for Communists as for Labour men. But what are they in the light of the events of to-day? What are they in the light of what we all know is the position of the Labour movement and common people in Nazi-occupied Europe, where we may be sure long ago all sections of the working-class movement have found the way to come together? What are they in the light of conditions in Nazi Germany itself, where we know that all sections of the working-class movement work together in the limited ways open to them, for the overthrow of Hitler? What are they in the light of the sacrifices that the British people have made since September, 1939? Or the gigantic sacrifices of the Soviet people?

And who will deny that once the way to a new understanding is found between the Communist Party and the Labour Party, for example, it will be warmly welcomed by the whole movement; or that it will not result in a great impetus in every section of the activities associated with winning the victory?

Who will dare to deny that once such unity is made possible, then an entirely new situation can open out? The sense of us all being together, all in it, all

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

giving of our best in a united manner, would wipe away many of the present feelings of frustration, of confusion and doubt.

If the way to any kind of united action can be found, however limited at first its scope may be, experience will soon pave the way to more important and decisive developments. This is why the Communist Party will do everything in its power to make such an understanding possible; and we will do it in such a way as will serve the common cause, and in a manner that will add to the power, unity, dignity and prestige of the whole Labour Movement.

Unity between every section of the working-class movement inevitably means a strengthening of national unity, bringing with it a strengthening of the National Government because it will then represent a stronger mass basis in the factories; and resulting in an all-round increase in everything that has to do with mobilising our resources to the maximum. This, in turn, will weaken the influence of the Men of Munich, and lead to a stronger and more united National Government.

Unity can help remove present social injustices and legitimate grievances that at present impede the maximum production and the best use of all available man and woman power. It can inspire the whole nation with the will to work, fight and sacrifice on the scale that the present situation demands, and to go into the coming gigantic battles to obliterate fascism from the face of the earth with the readiness that springs from political conviction rather than from automatic compulsion. Such unity in Britain will be hailed with joy by the working people in Nazi Germany and occupied Europe.

Why would it do all this?

Because it would lead to a renewed faith in the masses. A new revival of activity, that would soon result in stronger and more united forms of workshop, trade union, trades council, local labour organisations' activity: that would result in recruitment to the Labour Movement not by breaking any political truce, but by a united Labour Movement carrying out in a new way and a new spirit the every-day activities of the movement. The need for such a revival is a matter of common discussion in the Labour Movement; and we believe the Communist Party can help bring this revival about. We know that is the meaning and realisation of what this unity represents and what it would achieve, that will be the spur to action.

This is why, in the new political campaign that the Communist Party is opening, it will place the question of unity right in the forefront of its agitation and propaganda. We will aim to organise the greatest political demonstrations that Britain has ever seen. We will see that it is taken into every factory, every trade union branch and every local labour organisation. We will do everything in our power to help the nation to victory, but we know that this will best be realised when once the forces of labour, whatever their political label, have been brought together, working in unity to secure their common aim.

We shall aim to win fifteen thousand new members for the Communist Party, so that more organised people can work together to help forward unity in the working-class movement and a greater and stronger unity amongst the people as a whole, that will lay the basis not only for strengthening the present alliance between Britain and the Soviet Union, but for an international alliance of every democratic country that seeks the defeat of fascism.

These aims, and these alone, represent the policy of the Communist Party in the New Year now opening out before us. It will be a year of terrible trial and anxiety. It will be a year of selfless sacrifice and devotion. There will be many homes that will suffer bereavement. There will be many who will face death unafraid and proud to die in defence of democracy against fascism. There will be millions in the workshops who will show the world what Britain can produce. The people of Britain and the Soviet Union will come closer still as they fight against the fascist beasts.

But 1942 can also be the turning point, the year that will make sacrifice worth while; the year that will see blows struck at Hitler from the East and the West; the year that will see the mass movement against Hitler in the occupied

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries rise to new heights of daring and courage; the year that will see the working people of Nazi Germany also strike blows at the tyrants.

Let it also be the year when the working men and women of Britain, and their organisations, at last got together, at last pooled their resources of leadership and strength, and embarked upon a united campaign for victory that brought to its banner the entire people of our country.

We appeal with confidence to every reader of the *Labour Monthly* to assist in hastening this unity.

The grim and terrible realities of the present have extinguished the differences of the past. A new perspective is opened out. Already there is much discussion about the fruitful possibilities before the peoples of Britain and the Soviet Union, when the peace has been won and we build again in peaceful construction.

Surely we of the Labour Movement, too, can get together, can forget the past because we are mindful of our present and future responsibilities? We owe it to our courageous and unconquerable people. We owe it to the mothers of our people now in the Armed Forces, who will have to face and give so much in our defence. We owe it to the wives and families of these men. We owe it to the men and women in industry, working and slaving as men and women never did before, who have given up cherished and hardly-won trade union rights and practices, to help in the destruction of fascism.

Unity in the Labour Movement means unity of a new kind between the men and women in the Armed Forces and industry—something that is new in Britain; something that prevents misunderstanding and avoids the one being played off against the other. It is this something new, this unity, that, once established, is the guarantee that after the victory over foreign fascists no reactionaries in Britain will dare take advantage of the colossal sacrifices the workers are making now. It is this unity of purpose and endeavour that alone can guarantee a peace of fulfilment and not of betrayal as was the case in 1918.

Japan

by DOROTHY WOODMAN

JAPAN'S naval blitzkrieg has had the immediate effect of lining up the powers of the world into their places in the struggle against fascism. Isolationism and appeasement have at last been recognised as abortive in dealing with the fascist powers. There is now taking shape a democratic front of the British Empire, the U.S.S.R., America, China and the Netherlands East Indies which could have prevented this world war, for this combination of powers is politically and economically far stronger than the fascist bloc.

The Japanese in this climax of fascist efforts to dominate the world have struck in an area which is the richest combination of raw materials, cheap labour and undeveloped markets: tin and rubber, oil and fibre, sugar and quinine, rice and tungsten, are here in vast quantities. The peoples—450 millions in China, 60 millions in the Netherlands East Indies, 12 millions in the Philippines—have a low standard of living, partly the result of historical development and partly because of the deliberate policy of industrialised countries which have benefited from cheap labour and cheap raw materials.

Japan has never been reticent about her policy. She has regarded East Asia as her lebensraum, and has said so in a multitude of official statements, from the time of the Twenty-one Demands on China in 1915 to Mr. Matsuoka's claim to Oceania in the spring of 1941. Her policy implied a challenge to British interests, as well as to those of America and Holland, or, alternatively, a willingness to co-operate on Japanese terms in the development of East Asia. Let us examine the various stages through which British policy has passed until to-day it has been shaken out of the period of appeasement into one of bitter warfare.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The years following the Meiji Restoration were characterised by Japanese neutrality, whilst Great Britain staked her trading claims on an unresponsive China. This neutrality was not one of choice, but of historical development. Japan's geographical position was a convenient counter against Russia, and, at that time, the balance of power depended precariously on the relative strengths of Russia, Prussia and France. This led to the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902.

The second period introduced the new factor of Japan's unexpected victory over Tsarist Russia in 1905. For the time being the Russian bogey disappeared. Britain's main rival was Germany. It was now British policy to remain neutral whilst Japan, with territorial ambitions as a prelude to trade, achieved the first victory by annexing Korea in 1910—the annexation was recognised by Great Britain, which omitted any reference to the independence of Korea when she renewed the Alliance with Japan in 1911.

The world war overshadows the third period. Great Britain was preoccupied in Europe and Japanese co-operation was rewarded by a Secret Treaty, subsequently confirmed by the Treaty of Versailles, promising her the former German islands north of the Equator. These islands are invaluable to her to-day as air and naval bases in her attacks on British and American shipping.

The fourth period began when American pressure brought China into the last world war. America, a Pacific as well as an Atlantic power, was more alive to Japan's potential rivalry, and foresaw the benefits of help to China. The result was that Japan was forced by the Nine Power Treaty, signed in Washington in 1922, to disgorge a good deal that she had been able to hold. But she was astute enough to appreciate the importance of naval bases in any future war for the control of the Pacific, and, whilst she agreed to withdraw from Shantung, she obtained a vital concession in the Five Power Treaty of 6th February, 1922, signed by Great Britain and America, that in the Pacific, beyond the 110th Meridian East, they would build no new fortifications or naval bases. Article 19 left Hong Kong and the Philippines at the mercy of the Japanese navy; assured her of the uninterrupted security of her wartime communications with her continental possessions and with China; and gave her the chance of gaining the first success in a war in those areas.

The Washington Conference and the Five Power Naval Treaty involved the recognition of a new balance of power in the post-war world. Japanese naval supremacy in the Far East was accepted on the assumption, implicit in the Nine Power Treaty, that she would co-operate peacefully in the development of China and entertain no aggressive territorial ambitions. This suited America which had no desire for land, but wanted an open door to the homes of the 450,000,000 people in China. It suited British policy, which once again during this period wanted to keep on good terms with a potential ally against the Soviet Union.

During this period a new factor was introduced into the Far Eastern stage. This was the Russian revolution, which had a tremendous influence throughout Asia. Indeed, the historian of the future may very well record the impact of the Soviet Union on the Far East, and the example of its achievements as a turning point in the history of the Asiatic continent. For some years, when British and American policies not only appeased Japan, but provided her with the raw materials and oil which enables her to make the biggest naval blitzkrieg in history and to accumulate vast resources which make her so formidable in the first stages, at any rate, of the Pacific War, the Soviet Union sent supplies to the Chinese Government and cut down her trade with Japan. This was a logical development of her Asiatic policy.

In the past four years China's resistance has been a second vital factor in the Pacific. But, just as in 1931, British policy was prepared to sacrifice China and the League of Nations rather than offend its one-time ally and endanger British interests, so in 1937 the spirit of the Anglo-Japanese alliance still lived on. Appeasement was based on the belief that it was possible to come to some agreement with Japan, and so it probably

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have been if Britain had been prepared to become the junior partner in Japan's schemes for the exploitation of China. The idea that such co-operation with Japan was possible and even desirable persisted until recently. Vested interests in the Far East maintained to the bitter end the belief that their profits were safer in the hands of a fascist Japan than in those of the growing democratic China.

There are 250 million pounds invested in China, about 180 millions of which are in the Yangtse basin, so that an agreement with Japan whereby she developed Manchuria and North China, leaving British interests free to develop the Yangtse area, would have suited British policy.

Even when Japan had deserted her one-time British ally by signing the Tripartite Pact of October, 1940, sections of British opinion in official and business circles still cherished the illusion that an appeal could be made to the moderate elements in Japan which would be satisfied with a neutral position in the Axis camp. But whilst these people were willing to consider the Pact as little more than a gesture on Japan's part, and as another example of Germany's far-flung propaganda, the United States saw the red light on the Asiatic horizon and heeded the warning by preparing a more active politic in the finances of China and a more active strategy in Pacific waters. The British Government, as unwilling to see the United States as Japan steal from her the remaining vested interests she still holds in the Far East, and having been persuaded that no further agreement with Japan was likely, followed suit, and at long last in the spring of 1941 the two countries co-operated in giving financial aid to China. The logical sequence of joint aid to China was a firmer attitude to Japan, and this was expressed in July of this year by the Anglo-American-Dutch decision to freeze Japanese assets, and to refuse to continue the supply of oil and essential war materials. Up until this time American firms had supplied Japan with about 65.5 per cent. of her oil supplies, with 90 per cent. of her scrap iron, and with a number of other essentials.

The British Empire had adopted the same policy of helping Japan not only to fight the war in China, but to build up vital reserves for the Pacific battle. So British firms had helped Hitler and Mussolini to build up their war machines, and to make the Axis bloc the formidable military, naval and air combination that we now have good reason to appreciate.

The last flickering shadows of appeasement as far as British policy was concerned seemed to fade when Hitler invaded the Soviet Union on 22nd June. Already, in the earlier part of the year, British and Australian and Indian troops had been moved into Malaya, the waters round Singapore had been mined and, with the co-operation of the Governments of Australia and the Netherlands East Indies, a chain of aerodromes had been built in an arc stretching from Burma through the Malay Straits, the Netherlands East Indies and across to Port Darwin, whilst America co-operated in discussions of naval and air strategy in the Pacific, and step by step prepared her bases stretched thinly in widely-spread stepping stones across the ocean. Pearl Harbour on Oahu, one of the Hawaiian Islands, became the centre of America's Pacific strategy, and was reputed to be deep and large enough to shelter at the same time most of the American fleet. To the south and west islands and atolls were surveyed as potential air patrol stations, and naval bases were still under construction on Midway, Wake, Johnson and Palmyra Islands when the Japanese struck. Only as recently as March of this year, the decision was taken to make harbour improvements in Guam island. With the ring of Japanese fortifications surrounding it, and the fortified Japanese island of Saipan only 120 miles away, the decision was obviously a belated one. This, like other American decisions, had been opposed and held up by various groups in America, and, above all, the Isolationists, whose policy has been a factor of great positive importance not only in deepening the forces making for appeasement, but in her late preparations to meet the Japanese attack.

In the north as in the south Pacific America had started to build up a series of naval and air bases. There are two of them at Fairbanks and Anchorage,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now the largest airfield in Alaska, the key to her defence and the army's major base in the far North. The navy is constructing three air bases at Sitka, Kodiak and Chernofski Bay on Unalaska Island, in the chain of the Aleutians, whilst Dutch Harbour on Unalaska and Kodiak are two other naval bases, with Sand Point, near Seattle, as the base for supplies and repairs.

Parallel with these leisurely preparations, President Roosevelt tried to make some agreement with the Japanese which might have given him a further chance to prepare for the war which by now seemed certain. The Anglo-American-Dutch agreements in July, 1941, to freeze Japanese assets and to put an embargo on Japanese goods and on the sale of oil and war materials to Japan, were followed up by the Washington talks. Those talks we now know were a deliberate smokescreen on the part of Japan to enable her to move her navy and air force into position. On 7th December, whilst Mr. Kurusu and Ambassador Nomura were paying one of their almost daily visits to Mr. Cordell Hull, the Japanese navy carried out the biggest naval blitzkrieg in the history of naval warfare. In a carefully-planned and well-synchronised campaign, she struck at Pearl Harbour, at the islands of Midway, Wake and Guam, at Manila, at Hong Kong, and she had done her work so well in Thailand that she was able to disembark her troops there and use the territory as air bases. She has already occupied the vitally important aerodrome of Kota Baru on the Thai-Malayan frontier, and she is now in an uncomfortably strategic position to threaten the Burma Road and Singapore from the land side.

In the case of Pearl Harbour, "the United States services were *not on the alert* against a surprise air attack" said Colonel Knox (Secretary of the U.S. Navy), who added that, with the possible exception of Norway, the "most effective Fifth Column work of the entire war was done in Hawaii." The chiefs of the American forces were immediately dismissed. The serious situation in Malaya, still more unexpected because of the utterly unwarranted optimism of official statements locally in the last few months, has not so far been followed by any dismissals.

Meanwhile, the Chinese have started what might prove to be a very important offensive behind Canton, and Chiang Kai-shek has once again offered the fullest co-operation. Perhaps at long last the value of Chinese resistance will be recognised and its co-operation used to the best advantage of the democratic front which Japan has now succeeded by her attack in constructing after years of division.

In the past, the failure to achieve that front, in the Far East as in Europe, has given initial victories to the Axis front. To-day Chinese resistance in Asia and Soviet resistance in Europe lead the way, and it is essential that both should be supported to the fullest extent. In the past the Axis front has thrived on the divisions between the democratic nations. There is an urgent need for a unified strategy, and Litvinof and President Roosevelt have already signified their willingness to support joint conversations with Britain, China and the Dutch East Indies.

Japan has undoubtedly made considerable headway in the first week of the Pacific war, and for this the Isolationists and the supporters of appeasement must be held partly responsible. To-day the mobilisation of the vast resources of the American continent can be seen on the horizon.

But this war is not only a war of strategy. It is a war in which the fate of millions of people throughout Asia is involved. In most cases they have served as a reservoir of cheap labour, and their demands for self-government have remained unanswered. They might become fertile soil for Japanese propaganda. Whether or not this happens, and how far they can be mobilised in this war, depends on the policy of the home country. If Britain would lead the way in an enlightened policy towards India and Burma this would go a long way towards clearing the way for the active participation of the peoples of Asia in the common struggle which also represents their own vital interests and victory in which is essential for their future emancipation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wages and the War Effort

by PETER KERRIGAN

THE attack by Japan on Great Britain and the United States has immeasurably sharpened every one of the problems we have to face. The immediate effect, apart from results of military actions, is likely to be less munitions and food for Britain. Yet the needs of the Russian and Libyan fronts are growing. New battlefields have opened in Malaya, Burma and Hong Kong.

Above everything stands the necessity for developing as speedily as possible the second front in Europe which Stalin showed must come. In these circumstances, the Government's sweeping proposals for increased mobilisation of man and woman power are anything but premature, and are welcomed by growing numbers of people who realise their absolute necessity in this gigantic World War. That welcome would have been much greater but for the widespread feeling that there is no equality of sacrifice, and that the positions of power and privilege are not affected.

Nowhere is that feeling so widespread as among the workers in the decisive industries of this country, particularly on the wages issue. At the same time, a number of related questions—such as Income Tax, food and transport—contribute to the general feeling of anger and discontent.

Politically, the workers have never been so united as since June 22nd, when Hitler launched the attack that brought into existence the Alliance of Britain and the U.S.S.R.

As the months have passed, with each day bringing fresh examples of the heroism and power of our Allies, so has the determination of the British workers grown to emulate these deeds and increase our contribution to the common victory.

Yet we know that the war effort is still a considerable way short of 100 per cent., and the decisive force in the factories which more than anything could alter this position is not paid the wages to enable it to do the job properly.

Is there a real grievance on wages? There is, and the official Ministry of Labour *Gazette*, which is being quoted to try to prove how well off the workers are, actually demonstrates the opposite.

The Government expects to bring millions of additional women into industry. Here, from the *Labour Gazette*, are the average earnings of women (all trades) in the week ended 12th July, 1941 :—

	s.	d.
Women (18 years and over)	44	4
Girls (under 18 years) ..	25	2

For Engineering, the average earnings are :—

	s.	d.
Women	48	2
Girls	27	10

Note that these are the *average earnings*, and not the *weekly wage rate*, which is much lower. Taken in midsummer, they include overtime, night shift, piecework and bonus payments that hide a miserable base rate. Since then, women in engineering have reeeived a 5s. increase on their basic rate of £1 per week, which, with bonus, brings them up to 43s. Many who are on piecework, earning more than the minimum, have not had any addition to their rates. No one, knowing something of the strenuous work—ofttimes to accurate limits—entailed on women in Engineering—will argue that these earnings (never mind the weekly wage rates) are adequate. If the Government has vision, it will insist on a substantial upward revision of women's wages and enforce payment of the rate for the job. More than ever, it is important, when such a large percentage of new entrants into industry are married women, to establish guarantees against these women being used as a lever to lower the wages of men.

It will be as well here if we debunk the utterly mendacious campaign against the alleged high wages of youth. The Press regularly carries stories of the demoralising effect on our youth of wages from £5 to £7 per week.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let us deal with facts instead of fallacies. The *Labour Gazette* reports that *average earnings for youths and boys* for the week ended 12th July, 1941, in all 16 groups of industries covered (these include Mining, Building, Engineering, Shipbuilding, Transport, etc.) as 40s. 7d. It should be particularly noted that the term "youths and boys" includes all males up to 21 years of age. In some industries the adult rate is received between 18 and 21 years. In General Engineering the average earnings for youths and boys was 40s. 4d., Marine Engineering 37s. 8d., and Shipbuilding and Ship Repair 37s. 10d. Yet the Engineering employers have just refused the application of the Engineering Unions for an increase in the percentages on which the apprentices' wages will be calculated in relation to the journeyman; and the Arbitration Tribunal has rejected the claim of the T.G.W.U. and N.U.G.W. for an increase for boys and youths other than apprentices.

The Railway Executive has rejected the N.U.R. demand for £3 minimum on base rates exclusive of war bonus, and the claim now goes to the Railway Staff National Council, the next step in preparation for case going to Railway Staff National Tribunal.

The Transport and General Workers' Union, whose Biennial Conference declared in favour of a wage increase, are preparing their case for Road Passenger and other services.

It is worth noting in connection with the latter that the percentage increase in earnings for Tramway, Omnibus Service and other Road Passenger Transport between October, 1938, and 12th July, 1941, is 21.4 per cent., while the cost-of-living increase in the shorter period from 1st September, 1939, to October, 1941, is fully 29 per cent. according to the official cost-of-living figures.

Let us revert to the Engineers and Shipyard workers, because it is around the issue of their demands that the main battle is being fought, and the results here will have a big effect on all other sections of the working class.

Is their claim a just one? Anyone who reads their case as set out in the pamphlet of the A.E.U., "Arms and Wages," must concede it is. The A.E.U. claims 4d. per hour increase. The other Unions, including the Shipbuilding Unions, up to £1 per week. The rate for a skilled man on the Clyde is 77s. 8d. in Marine work. It is 76s. 6d. on Tyneside and 81s. 5d. in London for a 47-hour week. According to the *Labour Gazette*, the earnings during week ending 12th July, 1941, for men were £5 6s. 8d. in General Engineering, £5 8s. 2d. in Marine Engineering, and £5 16s. 7d. in Ship Repairing.

The Press has blazoned it forth that the figures of *average earnings* for week ending 12th July, 1941, of all workers, show an increase of 42 per cent. (in all categories of Metal, Engineering and Shipbuilding it is 49.2 per cent.). What the newspapers do not publicise to the same extent is that *the average level of rates of wages for a full ordinary week's work exclusive of overtime was about* 18 *per cent. higher in July*, 1941, *than in October*, 1938. Place this against the 29 per cent. increase in the cost of living between 1st September, 1939, and October, 1941, together with the other factors mentioned above, and you begin to get the picture in its proper perspective. Another point—large numbers of workers in Engineering are still on time wages without bonus or piecework additions.

The *Financial News*, 24th November, says on this :—

> It is not known precisely how many men are still paid on a time basis, but, from the figures of average earnings attached to the employers' reply to the A.E.U. demand, it would appear that as high a proportion as 40 per cent. of the total employees of the federated firms were on a time basis last July. Most of the trades engaged in shipbuilding and repairing work are included in this 40 per cent.

After dealing with higher earnings in summer time, the *Financial News* continues :—

> In the winter months, however, hours of work rarely exceed the normal 47, but Income Tax is deducted on the basis of their average earnings throughout the previous year. Thus some of them are reduced almost to the statutory minimum of £2 in their worst weeks. The sense of unfairness is enhanced by the fact that certain shipbuilding trades, *e.g.*, boilermakers, are normally paid on piecework. During a period of intensive work, *e.g.*, a rush job in the short winter days, the boilermakers may collect quite a handsome pay packet at the end

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the week, while the fitter goes home with the District rate of 77s. 8d. less deductions, which often bring his earnings below the £3 mark.

We have quoted from this organ, because no one will accuse it of being biased in favour of the workers.

References so far have applied to skilled men. The semi-skilled are paid less, while there are large numbers of labourers, many of them members of the A.E.U., whose time rate is less than £3 per week. It is a fact that both on the railways and in Engineering there are scores of thousands whose basic rate is now lower than the minimum for Agricultural workers, who were previously regarded as the poorest paid of all workers.

Apart from exaggerations of the actual wages paid, upon what is based the opposition to increases, which—according to Sir Alexander Ramsay—would lead to similar applications in all other industries? The opposition puts up the case (and here it is able to quote the Government White Paper of 2nd July, 1941, on Price Stabilisation and Industrial Policy) on the danger of inflation arising from High Wages. The bogy of the Vicious Spiral is trotted out, and it is argued that the Engineers' increase would mean £37,000,000 added to wages.

Jack Tanner was correct when, in submitting the men's claim, he argued that any consideration of wages stabilisation must wait until there is recognition that the present wage levels do not provide a proper standard of living, and the rationing system needs to be extended to all goods in short supply.

The real reason for the employers' resistance was let out in the final remarks of Sir Alexander Ramsay, rejecting for the Engineering employers the men's claim. Read carefully this gem :—

Finally, let it not be forgotten that, as I said at the beginning, we have to win the peace when we have won the war. I think it would be bad statesmanship if we were to take unnecessary steps at this moment to build up standards which we should be unable to maintain when we do return to and carry on our life and trade under more normal circumstances. I have to advise you, therefore, that after great deliberation, and having regard to the considerations I have tried to put before you and others, the Federation have come to the conclusion that the applications that you have put before us must be refused.

Does Sir Alexander look forward to a peace which will see a return to cut-throat competition (inevitably leading to a next war) with slashing attacks on the Engineers' standards, and does he want the attack not to be made more difficult by too high wages now? What an insult to the workers! I have already shown how false is the talk of high standards, but it is this kind of attitude which has, together with the actual position of the workers, created the existing strong feelings.

The Tribunal has now awarded the 5s. per week flat rate increase to all men in the Shipyard and Engineering industries. This award is bound to be regarded as inadequate. It is not on the basic rate, and therefore cannot be taken into account in calculating the percentage of piecework earnings on the basic rate. It perpetuates another grievance, namely, that all wage increases since the last war are calculated as a national bonus, really a continuation of the war bonus awards of 1914–18.

Its principal defect, however, is that it is not sufficient to meet the needs of the men, and it will certainly not satisfy the time workers in Shipbuilding and General Engineering. This would appear to be recognised to some extent in the Tribunal statement that "negotiating machinery is being used to adjust anomalies between different classes of workers." The new agreement to grant maintenance men, markers-out, setters-up in General Engineering, a wage rate 8/- above the ordinary craftsman only partially meets the need and has not touched the ship building side at all. The workers will continue to press their claims. Their attitude and reasons have been stated with complete clarity by Jack Tanner in submitting their case to the employers. He said :—

We are concerned with the basic and primary urgency of efficient war production in our industry for the purpose of defeating Hitlerism; that, to this end, we regard the well-being of the workmen as an essential prerequisite; that at the present time the efficiency of the Engineering workers is impaired by wage levels that do not meet the human needs of men taking an abnormal toll of their physical endurance, while at the other end of the scale, efficiency in production is being reduced by methods that yield greater profit to the employers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We are almost at the time when the Income Tax issue will reach its most acute stage. The deductions due to commence in January will be on earnings over the six months April to October, 1941. The enhanced earnings of the period, which includes the summer, inevitably means that the 5s. wage increase will be swallowed in the higher deductions ahead.

I have already shown the effect of Income Tax on wages when heavy deductions take place on a shrunken pay packet. The workers are making sacrifices to defeat Hitlerism and they will make more. Yet they see that the rich are still rich. When the *Daily Telegraph* wants to impress them by the terrible lot of the poor rich man who, out of an income of £10,000 a year, is left with only £3,168 for himself, they look at their pay packets and laugh. Engineers have, by nature of their calling, the ability to calculate, and their wives—like those of all other workers—are quite capable of working out the percentage of sacrifice in this case.

Here are only two examples of the workers' position taken from shipyard workers in a firm at Hebburn-on-Tyne. One is a tradesman and the other a labourer :—

Example 1

Plumber, worked 50 hours on time rate, received	... £3	10	2
After Income Tax deduction of		11	10

Example 2

Labourer, worked 50 hours on time rate, received	... £2	15	5
After Income Tax deduction of		5	3

In both these cases the men had done three hours' overtime, which is included in their wage payments, so that even before tax deductions their rates were only £4 2s. and £3 0s. 8d. respectively.

Enhanced rates for overtime, because of the extra strain, etc., have been paid for many years. Engineers and other workers have rightly fought for and maintained this principle. Now Income Tax deductions mean in large numbers of cases that men who work overtime receive after stoppage of tax less than they get for ordinary day time hours. This causes terrific resentment that could be eliminated by exempting all overtime from Income Tax. Its effect on production would be instantaneous.

I would sum up by putting as the main issues in this respect :—

1. The need for granting balance of the full wage claim of the Engineering workers.

2. Follow this by doing the same in the case of the Railwaymen.

3. Raise all workers' wages to the level demanded by the rise in the cost of living, travelling payments for evacuated families, living away from home, and meet the special claims of the low-paid workers.

4. Abolish Income Tax on overtime earnings.

5. Guarantee earnings commensurate with the skill of key men at present on time rates, by the introduction of collective bonus, or payments of special rates for men whose jobs are of a character that do not permit piecework, but upon whose skill and craftsmanship the efficient and rapid work of millions of other workers on piecework depends.

6. Enforce payment to women workers of the rate for the job, and guarantees against married women in industry being used as a lever to force down the wages of the men.

7. Give definite guarantees backed by penal clauses that whatever wages are earned on piecework or bonus, the rate shall not be reduced.

8. For Youth in Engineering and Shipbuilding, wages to be calculated on the percentage of 33⅓ per cent. to 90 per cent. according to age, as requested by the Unions, with a special flat rate increase all round to meet the cost-of-living problems.

If this programme was operated, production would jump upwards at a greatly increased rate, until we rapidly reached the all-out stage, as far as the workers are concerned.

The Agricultural workers have shown how to campaign for their demands in a way that is a model for all other workers. It is along this way that the Engineering workers can also succeed in establishing their case, and defeat any attempts by elements which include the employers to precipitate stoppages of work.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The 12th Anniversary of the Daily Worker

by W. RUST

LIFT the ban on the *Daily Worker*. This cry echoes throughout Britain; it is taken up in the factories and trade unions, and in the columns of the national Press. On all sides the strong conviction is expressed that the continued ban on this anti-fascist newspaper is a violation of our democracy and detrimental to the national interests.

January, 1942, marks the twelfth anniversary of the *Daily Worker*. It also completes the twelfth month of the ban, which was imposed on January 21, 1941, under Regulation 2D. How long is this ban to continue? Is a section of working-class opinion to be *permanently* deprived of the right of expression in the daily Press?

Popular opinion is quite emphatic in declaring that the ban has lost whatever justification the Home Secretary claimed for it one year ago. To-day there is an entirely new world situation. The war has become a real people's struggle against fascism, and a new political unity has come into existence. There is no case, and none has been stated, for the continuation of a ban on a newspaper which has unswervingly advocated an Anglo-Soviet Alliance over a long period of years.

The editorial board of the *Daily Worker* has taken all possible steps to make its political position quite clear to the Government and the people. At the beginning of July it stated that in the event of the ban being raised the *Daily Worker* would:

1. Give its full support to the Government and do everything possible to strengthen British-Soviet unity in the fight to bring about a people's victory over German fascism.
2. Direct its influence in the factories, mines and trade unions towards securing the maximum production for victory.
3. Handle international affairs from the standpoint of encouraging the liberation fight of the people in the countries enslaved by German fascism.

Despite this declaration the Home Secretary has refused to reconsider the suppression order.

Since the conclusion of the Anglo-Soviet Alliance the demand for the lifting of the ban has swelled enormously in volume. The membership of the trade unions opposed to the ban now totals 2,269,049. In addition, there are 107 trades councils and a large number of shop stewards' committees. The Co-operative Societies, Guilds and Educational Committees against the ban represent a membership of two and a half millions.

During this period the *Daily Worker* staff has produced several broadsheets, primarily aimed at stimulating the productive effort in the war industries, and whose circulation has outstripped all previous achievements in the history of working-class journalism. In some factories the demand has been so great that the workers have queued up in order to buy copies of "The Worker," "British Worker," etc.

Evidence of the unfaltering devotion of the workers to their paper is to be seen in the remarkable way in which the contributions to the People's Press Fighting Fund are maintained at over £1,000 per month. There could be no better proof of the confidence felt by the former readers that they will succeed in obtaining the restoration of their paper.

This January is the first anniversary of the *Daily Worker* without the paper itself. But never before was its influence so great and the demand for it so keen! This is because the unity against fascism, which the *Daily Worker* had so strenuously advocated, is at last being realised in practice. The people want their paper back, so that it can continue to play its part in the great struggle to bring about the final destruction of fascism and the extermination of the Hitler gang.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

India in the War

by V. K. KRISHNA MENON

THE war has spread and now envelops the whole world. Indian territory is within the zone of warlike operations by sea, land and air. General Wavell's headquarters have announced that Eastern Bengal, Assam and Bihar are within the range of bombing planes. Far away in the west, Bombay, the port for supplies to the Middle East and to the Soviet Union, also faces peril; the Bombay Government has called for fire watchers. The grimness and destruction of war has now been visited on the Indian people who have no responsibility for the policies of past years and decades that have plunged humanity into war and the terrors of Nazi-fascist savagery. But they cannot seek seclusion from its consequences or from the call it makes to all people who value freedom.

Just outside India's borders actual war rages. Malaya, the Dutch East Indies, Hong Kong, Thailand and Burma have been attacked. India's nationals have already had the baptism of war at the hands of the Japanese. For in the Federated Malay States are nearly half a million Indians out of a total population of two millions. In Singapore and Burma are vast Indian populations. Indian soldiers and armed police are part of the defenders of these territories. Equipment must needs reach these lands partly from India. The gateway to the Indian Ocean now stands threatened. With the American reverses and the grave British losses in the Pacific this threat becomes more sinister.

India's north-western flank also faces danger. For decades, almost ever since there was a British Empire in India, her rulers have professed to guard her north-western frontiers against an invasion by Russia and "raids" by hostile tribesmen. At the moment there is irony in this; for the Soviet Union bars the Nazis in their eastward march, and has both by her might and the example of her civilisation neutralised the dangers by way of Iran.

On her west also India's strategic position proclaims its significance just as much. The supply routes to the Soviet Union and the supplies themselves are gravely related to the situation in respect of India.

Thus both the major strategy and the needs in men and material for the world war as a whole, the supplies to and collaboration with the U.S.S.R. (whose historic resistance, and now counter-attack, is the central factor in the overcoming of fascism), the defence of India herself and the meeting of the new enemy in Eastern Asia and the Pacific, cast India into a most significant role which can be neglected only at great peril. Not only her strategic position but her immense material resources which await utilisation, her vast man power which awaits mobilisation, and her passionate and anti-fascist fervour which remains to be unleashed, are all potent factors which add immensely to her importance.

But what is the situation in India to-day? After more than two years since the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, proclaimed in New Delhi that India was at war, these immense resources remain largely sterile, the man power unmobilised for war or production. Indian economy is still partly anarchic and partly conditioned to meet the rapacious greed of vastly dilated vested interests. Proclaiming the necessity of supplying the Eastern theatre from India and of pooling Britain's resources in the East, the British Government, in the days of Mr. Herbert Morrison at the Ministry of Supply, set up what has now become the Eastern Group with its headquarters in India. It has aroused the antagonism of Indian industry and public opinion; and is openly suspected of being concerned about the protection of Dominion and British interests at the expense of the Indian manufacturer and producer and the Indian masses. It seeks to rally Indian resources by keeping the effort to do so out of the competence of Indian public opinion and the currents of Indian national life. Its organisation is notoriously inefficient and wasteful. It is incapable, even if it desired to do so,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of enlisting public fervour and enthusiasm. It is afraid of Indian industrial development which may compete with imperial and monopolistic interests.

The results are only too plainly visible in the figures officially produced. Only the other day Mr. Amery announced triumphantly that the ordnance factories in India employed fifty thousand workers! There are five million workers in large-scale industry in India, about twenty-five to thirty million industrial workers altogether, and more than a hundred and fifty million adults who are capable of work in the whole country. India has built (or is building) one ship in the last hundred years or so. Yet she has the facilities, the man power, the talent and we are told even the necessary capital to embark on shipbuilding on a much larger scale. In the face of the huge losses at sea and the contingencies that loom so grimly before us, one would imagine that it is elementary prudence to spare no effort to increase all available tonnage against Hitler and the Axis powers. India has built one aeroplane, a trainer, last June or thereabouts. She may have built another since. The plant itself in Mysore State, not British India, was built in the face of official and British opposition, and is one for the purposes of "assembly." Mr. Amery, repeatedly questioned in the House of Commons about industrial development, the manufacture of internal combustion engines, the making of automobiles, ships and other implements now imperatively needed, has always returned a blank "No." His argument is that it is now "too late to start" industries that will be of use in this war. Before the war, it was considered no use starting them since they were not required for war purposes, so it is difficult to discover what is an opportune time.

This contrasts with the phenomenon of the Soviet Government moving factories bodily and building plants in deserts and mountain sides and everywhere else; the Chinese equipping themselves with small-scale and large-scale equipment in the course of their war behind the lines in the agricultural interior; while in Britain itself every garage is converted into a factory.

Production, yet more production is now the cry. Adequate production to replace the colossal toll of wider war alone can ensure victory. Hitler's European conquests secured for him plant, equipment, material, grain, fuel and raw materials which have vastly augmented Nazi striking power. This balance against the free forces has to be redressed, and whatever hinders that redress is a gift to the Nazis. Great parts of the world from which the Allies could and used to draw their raw materials and equipment, are either in enemy hands or cut off by enemy action on sea or land or ear-marked for the heaviest commitments. There are in India vast unexploited reserves of material easily accessible and stupendous man power lying idle and waste.

No one can dismiss lightly the "time" element in production. India while it has a very large-scale industry, is mostly undeveloped, and it is probable that the leeway to be made up is considerable. But the present exigencies demand supreme effort, and even a moderate effort could produce vast results given the will, the enthusiasm and the co-operation of the total elements of the nation.

These elements are passionately anti-fascist. The outlook of the Indian National Movement towards world affairs has been developed in the context of a British policy that in the post-1919 period sought imperial gains and consolidation, and since the emergence of fascism aided and abetted it unashamedly on every front where at present freedom stands assailed. This history is so well known as to need no recapitulation. So anti-fascist passion in India became synonymous with opposition to British foreign policy, its diplomacy and its wars. When war broke out in 1939 the Indian National Movement recognised that the assailant was the most bloodthirsty fascist, and what was at stake would ultimately affect such freedoms as existed in the world. India realised, too, that Hitler's main aim, at even that time, was the Soviet Union and the world beyond. It hoped that events would bring about a change in British policy. This has happened to a certain extent.

The Nazi attack on the U.S.S.R. has altered the character of the war for India. Nehru's first political utterance when he

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

came out of jail was to proclaim this change. The war, he said, "was not an imperialist war as it was when it started." The Nazi attack on the U.S.S.R. has altered its character, he said, but it had not unfortunately changed Britain's attitude to India.

Britain is now an ally of the Soviet Union, and fighting with all her resources and a united people behind her government to achieve a victory against fascism. Her factories are working overtime, and her entire man (and woman) power is sought to be mobilised for this purpose. Yet in India her policy nullifies this effort. It is a stupid policy, its tragedy may overwhelm us when it is too late. Instead of unleashing the passionate and vital forces of anti-fascism in India, the British Government imprisoned its most pronounced champions into jails and concentration camps. Some of them, including Nehru and Azad, are now freed; but thousands, including the Communists, Socialists and trade union and working-class leaders, are still in concentration camps or jails.

The releases recently effected register an advance which we may not underestimate or neglect. It is a minor victory for public opinion both here and abroad. It also offers opportunities for creating new situations advancing the common struggle.

The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress meets this month, and will no doubt reach momentous decisions. These are likely to include agitation for increased defence of India, for more vigorous activity for the development of resources, for greater assistance to China and the supplies to the U.S.S.R. But such a policy, combined with opposition to the Government, is wasteful; and would not have the same results in material and man power response as the leadership of a government by the nation's most vital elements. This alone can fully mobilise India.

To this latter solution, which appears so opportune and imperative, the British Government so far offers total opposition. The statements of the Secretary of State and the Premier has aggravated Indian opinion even outside Congress circles. It has alienated even the Moslem League. But, says Nehru, in spite of all this "the situation is not irretrievable." It must be retrieved. It is the task of the British people as of the Indians.

On the Indian side there is willingness, nay anxiety, to co-operate and be aligned in the general and common struggle against fascist ambition. This will express itself in Congress decisions and lead to new policies. There would be an opportunity which, if grasped, would create an amazingly new situation.

Our own task is to give all our support, to rally public opinion in this country, which will compel the Government to bring about a settlement. It is not merely a matter of settling the long-standing problem of Indian freedom, but of facing and solving one of the outstanding issues of war strategy, war production, political warfare and defence of territory against newer fascist attacks in the East. The grave events of the last few weeks make it more urgent than ever before.

The immediate step is that the British Government should instruct the Viceroy to negotiate with the Indian national leaders forthwith, agreeing beforehand to the setting up of a government under national leadership which would command the acceptance of the great majority of the people. Such a government is not only possible, but eminently practicable. It would set to work to release the political prisoners, establish civil liberty, turn at once to industrial development, supply the fighting armies as best as possible, release India's man power in a way that will amaze the world, and it will grow more food for the men and women who have to stand the increased strain. More than all perhaps, it would proclaim to all the world that India's four hundred millions are now fully enlisted in the world struggle against fascism; that they stand with the millions of China, of the U.S.S.R., of the U.S.A. and of Britain.

This is no distant prospect. We may view it just as a prospect only at our peril. It must be realised and realised now. A speedy settlement with India is imperative. It is no concession to India, it is no bargain by the Indians or surrender by the British, but part of the war strategy. It is as important as any other major factor for victory.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Burma

by MICHAEL CARRITT

THE Japanese attack on Malaya and Burma is not simply the outcome of her own imperialist ambitions. Japan acts as Hitler's ally, striking in the rear of the Great Powers that are pledged to aid the Soviet Union. The Far Eastern campaign is a part of the world conflict between Fascism and the Peoples, a conflict equally being fought out in Libya, in Yugoslavia, in Greece and beneath the nose of the Gestapo in Paris.

The people of the Far East are anti-fascist. China's epic struggle has kindled the flame of their sympathy and their own national awakening—in remote Tibet, in the backward tracts of the Wa and Shah States (on the North-East Frontier of India and Burma), and still more in Burma itself. Struggling for their own freedom, the people of Burma, like the people of India, have developed a high degree of political consciousness and organisational unity. They see the world aims of fascism and are anti-fascist; they see that their countries cannot be isolated from world events, and they are internationalist in outlook.

The Burmese people were extremely sceptical about the professed war aims of the British Government in the early period of the war. They wanted the principle of democracy and self-government to be given effect to within the Empire; and in respect of foreign relations they judged the good faith of the Government by its treatment of the Chinese people.

Since 22nd June of 1941 new forces have come into action which directly affect the aspirations for freedom of the Burmese. Without being basically changed in character, British imperialism is allied with the liberating might of the Red Army and the revolutionary national movements of all oppressed countries in a decisive world conflict between Fascism and the Peoples.

The declaration made by Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt, meeting in mid-Atlantic, was an indication that these two great leaders of powerful imperialist countries realised the basic change that had taken place in the war since the attack upon the Soviet Union. On 16th August the Premier of Burma, U. Saw, issued a statement on behalf of his Government, welcoming the Atlantic Charter and declaring that it was clear that "the principles declared thereby must have application to the people of Burma and their acceptance by the democracies must of necessity lead Burma to the attainment of her national freedom."

In October U. Saw came to London to obtain a definite guarantee from the British Government. In an interview with the Press he declared Burma's unqualified support for the struggle to defeat fascism, but demanded that the freedom was as much a right for his people as for the countries conquered by fascism. "The British Government," he said, "have given an assurance to India and Burma that they will give these countries self-government one day, but when that day will come is another question."

U. Saw, a moderate nationalist, a Government Minister since 1929, became Premier about 15 months ago. Previously carrying out a policy of cautious co-operation with the British Government, he has been unable to disregard the weight of popular pressure. *The Times*, in discussing the political background to U. Saw's London visit, states that "*the tides of nationalism are running high in Burma.*"

As in India, deep poverty and land hunger have driven the masses into increased political activity over the last quarter of a century. Lack of industrial development has accentuated recurrent economic crises and stirred the middle classes against British vested interests. The growth of a young working-class movement (the Sin-ye-tha) in Rangoon and in the oil fields has demonstrated, in a series of big strikes, not only that the working class is assuming a political importance, but also that it is capable of cutting across the old racial prejudice that divided Indian and Burmese workers against one another.

The Burman peasant lives a precarious and miserable life upon an inadequate plot of land. At the 1921 census the average size of agricultural holdings was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recorded as 5.6 acres, yet 60 million acres of land lie undeveloped and uncleared. The big landlords, as in India, rackrent their tenants. The export of rice accounts for more than one-half of Burma's trade, and the greater part of this goes to India. Burma's welfare is, therefore, inextricably bound up with that of India. During the world economic crisis, when the rice crop became unsaleable, a large-scale insurrection occurred in the Tharrawaddy district, which was only suppressed by the Government after more than a year of bitter fighting. Many leaders were executed and their heads exhibited through the streets of Prome.

Since 1930 the national movement has increased its influence and its organisational unity, maintaining close contact with the Indian National Congress. The political separation of Burma from India under the India Act (1935), though fully understood at the time as a step by British imperialism to weaken Burmese nationalism and strengthen its hold over Burma, could not succeed in breaking the links that exist between the two countries. Indeed, the result has been, in the long run, to hasten the development of an independent movement in Burma for national liberation.

Such, briefly, is the political background to U. Saw's visit to London. He spoke for a Burma more united than ever before in history, claiming that there were no important internal dissensions in his country. He declared Burma's loyalty to the struggle to defeat fascism. And he asked for a statement that the Atlantic Charter was applicable to his country.

But his hopes were dashed to the ground. U. Saw returns home, by way of America, with the knowledge that as far as the colonial people are concerned the British Government is still not prepared to guarantee them the freedom which it promises to the victims of fascist aggression. As in the case of Indian demands, Mr. Amery "reaffirmed" his Government's good intentions and the ultimate aim of granting self-government to Burma. As U. Saw remarked to Press interviewers, this reaffirmation is not likely to cut much ice in Burma, especially when it was accompanied by a series of patronisingly contemptuous articles in *The Times* which cast doubt upon the ability of Burmese to manage their own affairs, and poured scorn upon the muddle-headedness of those who thought that the Atlantic Charter could possibly have any application to the countries of the British Empire. At a moment when the bombs are falling upon Burma, when Burmese bravery and endurance will be a bastion of defence for the vital Burma Road that supplies our ally China with the sinews of war, it is a policy of bankruptcy to preach this superior nonsense and to hand out meaningless pie-in-the-sky to 70 million people whose moral and material strength can be a decisive asset on our side for the victory over fascism in the Far East.

For the strategic position of Burma is obvious. A mountainous and forested belt of land with a long coast line, Burma lies between India and China, has a frontier with Malaya and Thailand, and provides the lifeline along which China's essential supplies must pass in order to develop the land front against Japan.

U. Saw's visit to London will not have been in vain if, now that Japan has struck and Burma is in the front line, the people of Britain demand that the Government reconsider its reply to U. Saw. Burma has asked a straight question. Her claim is justified beyond all doubt. It is for the British people and the Burmese people together to overcome all obstacles which lie in the way of rallying and organising the maximum moral and material resources of the two countries for the defeat of the Axis menace to civilisation.

Publications Received

Paths to Peace by Frank Pick (Geo. Routledge, 2s. 6d., 96 pp.).
Science and Everyday Life by J. B. S. Haldane (Pelican Books, 6d., 192 pp.).
When We Build Again by Bournville Village Trust (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d., 138 pp.).
U.S.S.R. Speaks for Itself, Vol. 2, Agriculture and Transport (Lawrence & Wishart, 2s. 6d., 104 pp.).
Medicine and Mankind by Arnold Sorsby (Faber & Faber, 12s. 6d., 236 pp.).
Distant Point by Alexander Afinogenov (Pushkin Press, 2s., 95 pp.).
We Are Many by Ella Reeve Bloor (Lawrence & Wishart, 8s. 6d., 304 pp.).
How Moscow Was Won in 1917 by I. Mintz (Lawrence & Wishart, 6d., 48 pp.).
The Soviet Fighting Forces by Major A. S. Hooper (Frederick Muller, Ltd., 1s., 64 pp.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Imperialist War and National War

by V. I. LENIN

[*An excerpt from an article written by Lenin in August,* 1916, *in connection with a pamphlet by Rosa Luxembourg. We print this excerpt on the eighteenth anniversary of Lenin's death and the twenty-third anniversary of the murder of Rosa Luxembourg.*]

IT is, of course, understood that the fundamental concept of Marxist dialectics is that all discrete units in nature and in society are conditional and capable of movement, that there is no *single* phenomenon which could not, under certain circumstances, turn into its opposite. A national war *may* turn into an imperialist war, and vice versa. One example: the wars of the great French revolution began as national wars and were national wars. They were revolutionary: they stood for the defence of the great Revolution against the coalition of the counter-revolutionary monarchy. But when Napoleon had created the great French Empire by subjugating a whole series of European national states—states that had long existed, big states that were capable of living—then the national French wars changed into imperialist wars which in *their turn* produced national-liberatory wars *against* Napoleonic imperialism.

Only a sophist could blur the distinction between imperialist and national wars on the grounds that the one *may* turn into the other. Dialectics has more than once—even in the history of Greek philosophy—served as a bridge to sophism. But we remain dialecticians, fighting against sophisms not by denying all possibilities of changes in general, but as a means to reach to a concrete analysis of a *given* phenomenon as much in its momentary position as in its development.

It is in the highest degree improbable that the imperialist war of the years 1914-16 should turn into a national war; because the class which represents a forward development is the proletariat, which objectively strives to change the war into a civil war against the bourgeoisie; and also because the relative position of forces in the two coalitions are not very different, and because international finance capital has everywhere created a reactionary bourgeoisie. But we cannot declare such a transformation to be *impossible*: *if* the European proletariat proved to be powerless for twenty years, *if* the present war should end with Napoleonic victories and the subjection of a whole series of national states that are capable of life; *if* non-European imperialism (mainly Japanese and American) should also hold out for twenty years, without going over to socialism, for instance, as a result of a Japanese-American war,—then a large-scale national war in Europe would be possible. This would mean for Europe a *retrograde* development of several decades, and is improbable. But it is *not* impossible, since it is non-dialectical, non-scientific, and theoretically incorrect to imagine world history as progressing smoothly and accurately forward, without occasional enormous retrogressive steps.

What is more, in the period of imperialism, national wars on the part of colonies and semi-colonies are not only probable but *unavoidable*. In the colonies and semi-colonies (China, Turkey, Persia) there live almost a thousand million of people, that is, *more than half* the population of the world. National-liberatory movements are here either already very strong, or are growing and maturing. Every war is a continuation of politics by other means. The continuation of the national-liberatory politics of the colonies must *necessarily* be national wars on their part *against* imperialism. Such wars *may* lead to an imperialist war of the present "great" imperialist powers, but they may also not lead to this—it depends on a number of circumstances.

To take an example: in the Seven Years War Britain and France were fighting for colonies—that is, they were waging an imperialist war (which is possible on the basis of slave rule or of primitive capitalism just as much as on the contemporary basis of highly-developed capitalism). France was vanquished and lost a part of her colonies. Several years later there began a national-liberatory war of the North American

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States against Britain alone. France and Spain, who still owned a part of the present United States, were led by their hostility to Britain—that is, by their imperialist interests—to enter into a friendly agreement with the States that were rebelling against the English. We thus see a national-liberatory war, in which the imperialist co-operation appears merely as a secondary element without serious significance—the very opposite to what we see in the present war (where the national element in the Austro-Serbian war has no serious significance compared to the basic imperialist rivalries). From this we can see how senseless it would be to take the concept of imperialism as a formula and to deduct from it the "impossibility" of national wars. A national-liberatory war, *e.g.*, an alliance of Persia, India and China against this or that imperialist power, is completely possible and probable, since it would originate from the national-liberatory movement in these countries. The transformation of such a war into an imperialist war between the present imperialist powers would depend on many concrete circumstances which it would be absurd to take for granted.

Book Reviews

A Soviet Play

Distant Point by Alexander Afinogenov (Pushkin Press 2s).

SOVIET PLAYS AND Soviet films haven't been very plentiful here. Secretly, at night, and in odd corners they have appeared, but they were seen by the few, for most of the people were terribly afraid at any hint of the existence of such a power as the Soviet Union. To them, proud of their ignorance, the Soviet land was where massed executions took place at every tick of the Kremlin clock; where everyone spent their little leisure hunting for crusts of bread; where any glance upward meant instant arrest by a prowling machine called the Ogpu; and where the mass of people were rapidly becoming deaf and dumb mutes, losing the power of speech because for years and years they had been terrified into keeping their mouths closed; while the splendidly housed, richly clad, full-bellied Briton strolled round, doing whatever he listed, under the kindly and safe shelter of Neville Chamberlain's umbrella. The umbrella is now God knows where; the happy Briton has passed through a bloody time; and whatever partial peace and security we now enjoy is due entirely to the heroic and savage stand made by the Red Army against the Nazi legions. The Soviet people are now our comrades; so far, so good, though it is a shame that it took a war to tell us some of the facts about their greatness.

Well, here's a play that shows us, in a fine way, a little of the life of the Soviet people living at the back of God speed. It is simply written, simply set out, and (to me) at times singularly moving. "See this play," said the *Daily Worker*, "which has a profound message—the Bolshevik attitude to death." I think it has a profounder message still—the Bolshevik attitude to life. Death is always here in the background, while life is always to the fore. The play does more than that: it shows however seemingly insignificant a man or a woman may be, however desolate the place may be in which they live, there is important, never-ending work to be done by all; that these men and women in this place can do work that no-one else can do for them; that there is not, and cannot be, any insignificant thing in the life of man. We see this cunningly shown in the one day accidental association of a Red Army General with the few workers stationed at Distant Point, where the General, without any loss to the dignity of his rank, can break bread with the simple workers there, be merry with them, be a guide and comrade to them, be one with them in the great co-operative use of energy and skill for the good of all. The General does not know everything, but he is interested in everything, and so immediately interests all with whom he comes in contact. He opens their eyes to see, their ears to hear, and their minds to understand the many things around them. I wish we would do more of this kind of thing. I remember when I lived in Buckinghamshire there was a wild creeper that flooded the hedges in the summer. I asked the local people what it was, but none, from eighty years down to ten, could tell me. They had seen and handled it, but none knew what it was called. One day the local Methodist church ran a competition for its younger members—a series of questions about various things—like the B.B.C. brains trust, may be. One, a little girl, came to ask me what was the proper name of Mark Twain; but she knew nothing about the creeper flooding the hedges, nor was she encouraged to make any inquiry. Strangely enough, she was a member of the Girl Guides. But here there will be Players and Gentlemen, a D.S.C. for one, and a D.S.M. for another; men and women will be of no importance till the Nation's threatened with death, till our own Generals, Politicians and Leaders in general become like unto the Red Army General Malko; and that day can never come till Socialism hands over to the people the energetic control and use of all things.

But if the play contained only messages, it wouldn't be much. There's a play in it, and that play's the thing. It is well worth seeing, I'm sure; it is well worth reading: that I know.

I have heard that the author has since been killed in the war. That is a pity, that is a great pity, for the genuine stuff of the drama was evidently in the man. May this fight soon end in victory for the Soviet People, that no more such as he was may be lost to the world.

SEAN O'CASEY.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY DEVELOPMENT FUND

Amount received during December, 1941 : £96 : 11 : 8

Total received during 1941 : £903 : 16 : 4

It is a delightful job opening the post these days: Christmas presents are enclosed in nearly every envelope. So far, over 50 per cent. of all our subscription renewals have contained gifts for the Fund. For those of you who send in after the middle of the month, we should explain that we go to press on the 15th, and all sums arriving later than that will have to wait until the February issue for acknowledgment. We confidently anticipate that the actual total to the end of December will be far in excess of the very fine total to date. And the total for the whole year is more than double that of 1940.

Hear what some of you are saying about us: "You need this Christmas present more than some of my friends, so they'll have to go without this time." "We have decided to divert our presents this year to the most vital needs." "Thank you for the help and comfort and education of *Labour Monthly*." "I still read *Labour Monthly* as avidly as ever, and cannot think of the necessary superlatives it deserves."

Don't think that because we are smaller in size we need less money. Note the good paper we are now using!

	£	s.	d.
Llanelly D.G. ...		4	6
Biddulph D.G. ...		4	6
J. K. per A. R. M. ...		5	6
M. Archbold		2	6
Pinner D.G.		7	5
Willesden D.G. ...		10	0
M. H. G. J.	3	0	0
3 Red Airmen ...		15	0
H. B. Morton ...		2	6
R. F. B.	2	0	0
J. Macdonald		5	0
Peaslake		1	0
C. Penn		13	0
H. S. M.		2	6
R. C.		1	0
E. Blows		2	6
An Duine		10	0
Hyde D.G.		7	6
E. H. Wharton ...		10	0
F. Willis		10	0
T. W. Oliver		10	0
E. C. D. O. D.G. ...		5	0
Enfield D.G.		17	0
R. R., N.W.11 ...		10	0
F. Overington ...		2	6
S. A. Chandler ...	1	0	0
M. Christopher ...		2	6
Winchmore Hill D.G.		5	0
R. Anderson		5	0
P. Cogan		4	0
Carshalton C.P. ...		10	0
C. A. Morrison ...		2	6
W. J. Shottle		1	0
H. Tomlins	1	0	0
J. R. Bell		10	0
Newcastle (Staffs) D.G.		2	0
A. Wall		5	0
W. J. E.		10	0
J. B.		5	0
Worthing D.G. ...		4	0
Bridgend D.G. ...		3	0
N. Finchley D.G. ...		4	0
Wallingford D.G. ...		4	0
Bournemouth Soldiers' Group	1	0	0
Penrith D.G.		10	0
Aberdeen D.G. ...		9	0
S. E. B.		3	0
Miss Pratt	1	3	0
E. Goldsworthy ...		3	0

	£	s.	d.
H. W. Hall		10	0
E. Bray		10	0
Acton D.G.		5	0
Derby D.G.		2	6
Sutton Coldfield D.G.		3	0
D. Smith		5	0
T. A. Coe		2	0
Red N.C.O.		5	0
Harry Millar	1	0	0
Batley D.G.		2	9
W. F. Lakin-Smith ...		2	0
Gruzya Uchitiellya ...	1	0	0
C. Nunn		10	0
G. F. B.		5	0
Newcastle-on-Tyne D.G.		4	0
C. B. H.		6	2
Q. Z.		4	0
Stourbridge D.G. ...		5	0
Trowbridge D.G. ...		5	0
M. Christopher ...		2	6
A. Taylor		3	0
A.P.V. Offices ...		4	6
C. E. Butt		2	6
Tom Shortt		1	1
Hillingdon D.G. ...		5	0
Biddulph D.G. ...		3	6
E. P.	5	0	0
Ivor B.	1	0	0
N. Kelly		5	0
E. J. Gillett		10	0
Clifton D.G.		7	6
Forest Gate D.G. ...		5	0
Temporary Slacker ...		7	6
Hatfield D.G. ...		13	0
G. L. Jones		2	0
Anon., Whitchurch ...		1	0
Red Airman		5	0
Newcastle (Staffs) D.G.		2	6
A. J. A.		5	0
Swindon	1	0	0
E. D. McCallum ...		10	4
F. Sims		2	0
H. A. R. D.		2	0
R. Barrett		5	0
S. Berry		13	4
Berkeley		10	0
A. Walstow		4	0
C. Robson		5	0
R. R., N.W.3	1	0	0

	£	s.	d.
M. J. Carritt	1	0	0
Socialist Sailor ...	2	10	0
Corporal		10	0
N. & E. Lipton ...		5	0
Anon., Reading ...	1	0	0
Edmonton D.G. ...		6	6
F. D. O. ...	5	0	0
T. W. R.	1	0	0
H. A. F.	1	0	0
Kensington D.G. ...		5	0
Airman		5	0
H. Morgan		2	6
Woodford D.G. ...		5	0
Bacon Family ...		3	0
J. E. C. T.	1	0	0
Bombardier		5	0
Harpenden D.G. ...	4	10	0
G. Thomas	2	0	0
Woodford D.G. ...		3	6
N. Chingford D.G. ...	1	0	0
Altrincham Gp. ...		5	0
Windsor People's Convention	1	0	0
Golders Green D.G.		8	4
Red Infantryman ...		10	0
A. V.		2	0
G. M. Driver ...		8	0
Hereford D.G. ...		6	6
B. S. Beezer		3	0
L. Macgregor ...	1	15	0
D. J. Redfern ...		13	0
R. Hetherington ...		1	6
R. N. Millar		1	6
C. D. Bell		3	0
All Saints D.G. ...		3	0
Thanks to U.S.S.R. ...	10	0	0
R. Pearson		2	6
I. M. J.	1	0	0
Old Soldier		5	0
G. M.B.		5	0
Red N.C.O.		3	6
J. J. Christie		3	0
H. S. M.		2	6
R. C.		1	0
"E"		2	6
R. F. B.	2	0	0
Banstead D.G. ...		7	6
A. McMillan		1	3
Two Comrades ...	10	0	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reprinted by popular request

RUSSIA FIGHTS!

by

M. MacAlpin

In the words of the author, "This small book is a tribute to the Soviet people's fight for the future of humanity. It attempts to sketch the colossal battle and interpret the motives of the protagonists; and it is intended to convey a warning to British readers." **1/6** net

ON LENIN

by

STALIN

In outlining the roots of Lenin's outstanding ability and tenaciousness, Stalin has given invaluable lessons which are of immediate and practical use to the working-class movement to-day. **6d.** net

SERVING MY TIME

by

HARRY POLLITT

"There is nothing better in recent autobiography."

—Manchester Guardian

2/6 net

LAWRENCE & WISHART, 2, Southampton Place, W.C.1

BRITAIN IN THE WORLD FRONT

by R. Palme Dutt

(Editor of *Labour Monthly*)

Deals with the part to be played by the British people, as a decisive force in the world front established against Axis Fascism. The political and industrial problems of the immediate situation and the practical programme for their solution are dealt with in a comprehensive and lucid survey.

To be published early Spring at **7/6** net

LAWRENCE & WISHART · 2, Southampton Place, W.C.1

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED